The Pauline epistles, a critical study.
227.06 S85p 119341
Scott, Robert, M. A., D. D.
Life Pacific College Alumni Library

DATE DUE

227.06
S85p

Scott, Robert
... The Pauline epistles

LIFE Pacific College
Alumni Library
1100 West Covina Blvd.
San Dimas, CA 917

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-CBX-850

THE PAULINE EPISTLES

A CRITICAL STUDY

Printed by

MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

The Literature of the New Testament

THE PAULINE EPISTLES

A CRITICAL STUDY

BY

ROBERT SCOTT, M.A., D.D.,

BOMBAY

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

1909

LIFE Pacific College
Alumni Library
1100 West Covina Blvd.
San Dimas, CA 91773

L.I.F.E. College Library
1100 Glendale Blvd.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90026

PREFACE

THE purpose of this volume is twofold — to indicate the teaching of the Pauline Epistles and to set forth a theory of authorship based on characteristics of thought and style. The necessity of stating the latter with some fulness has required a contraction of the former. As a study of the doctrines of the Epistles, this Essay is a preliminary sketch. It may prepare for a fuller examination both of the very distinctive system of the apostle and of the more eclectic instruction here attributed to an associate son of exhortation. Perhaps the paradox may be ventured that this study of the Epistles has its most important aspect in the light it incidentally attempts to throw on the Gospels— on the authorship or author of the First and on the mind of the writer of the Third.

R. SCOTT.

022583

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	The Critical Attitude—Four Groups	1
II.	The Foundations	31
III.	The Epistles to the Corinthians	61
IV.	The Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, Philippians; Later Epistles	96
V.	Characteristics of Paul's Epistles; Theological, General	133
VI.	The Epistle to the Ephesians, and Kindred Epistles	180
VII.	Other Writings of the Second Group: The Gospel of Matthew	215
VIII.	Characteristics of the Second Group of Epistles	266
IX.	A Third Group: The Epistle to the Colossians	295
X.	The Pastoral Epistles—Luke	329
	Index of Subjects	373
	Index of Chief Texts	375

THE PAULINE EPISTLES

CHAPTER I

THE CRITICAL ATTITUDE

THE Epistles of Paul are the fountain-head of Theology. Their expositions of Christian doctrine are, it is true, given indirectly rather than directly. They are for the most part either occupied with problems bearing on the interpretation of the religion of the Old Testament and its Messianic culmination, or they give instruction to nascent churches in such fragmentary form as is called forth by the circumstances and needs of the moment, or they enjoin disciples how to believe and act and bear themselves in the face of a hostile pagan world. In such ways the faith delivered to the saints found expression in written communications that have become the richest literary treasure of our race. Naturally, free letters preceded formal treatises; and though collections of the sayings of Christ, or narratives of His deeds, may have begun

to be circulated at an earlier period, it is certain that the Epistles of Paul are prior to any doctrinal essays such as Hebrews or 1 John, or to any of the elaborate didactic records to which has been given the name of Gospels. Some one has, indeed, discovered that Paul was not a theologian. And doubtless, being content to be deemed an ambassador, he would have willingly resigned that title to the beloved disciple. Nevertheless it is to Paul we go for proof texts of most of the doctrines that we wish to submit to the test of texts.

For various reasons the hour seems to have come when a free discussion within the ranks of the Church regarding origins and authorships and types of doctrine and varieties of style is opportune. The advent of the secular historian and critic is a proof that whether the Church lead or lag the problems will be probed. And for ourselves, it must be clear that until the dates and sequences of the Epistles, with the various questions of authorship, audience, and occasion, are known no Biblical theology of the N.T. can be fully scientific. Knowledge of detail is necessary for a fruitful knowledge of the whole. And a discussion of the divergences of parts, with their inter-relationship and distinctness of purpose, will promote a comprehension of the breadth and depth of Christianity. Again, it is evident that without historical knowledge and critical insight regarding the planting of Christianity in respect of the variety of activities, the interdependence of agencies, the modes of worship and government, in city or

village, amongst Jewish or Gentile converts, and the relation of these to ancient custom or new instruction or accidental requirement—without (that is to say) a knowledge of how far the various shapes to which the new ideas gave rise depended on the interaction of doctrine and environment—the early Christian organisation, and therewith the forms that still divide, will never be correctly ascertained.

The initial questions of origin and of authorship are therefore important for the Church; and a solution of problems should be welcomed. Many indeed still live in a paradise of satisfaction with tradition, and are unconscious that real problems exist. On the other hand, the unwary reader often casts his eye on the statement that the literature of the N.T. belongs not to the founding of Christianity, but to the second or even the third century, and is sometimes beguiled by the affected impartiality with which such errors are assumed. But to orthodox and heterodox, to traditionalist and revolutionary alike, the disturber of dreams is truth; in whose unveiled presence erroneous fantasies disappear as bats in the morning light. It is right, therefore, that the books of the N.T. should be exhibited not merely as the substance of the Christian revelation, but also as a succession of treatises called forth by circumstances of city and province, reflecting the types and training of apostolic founders; exhibiting also the rapid development of ideas in the conflict of the new faith with the old, and the elasticity of religious truths now manifesting themselves in unexpected

conditions in the effort to conquer the Gentile mind. This task is very subordinate to the interpretation of Christianity, and of Christ. But though subordinate, it is necessary. And it is hoped that the suggestions of this volume will be helpful in a preliminary approach to the great themes round which it moves. These suggestions materially modify accepted opinion; but they re-establish the old dates. And if they are found in conformity with reason and fact, they will tend to dissipate the vague and groundless notion that important parts of the N.T. were written by men who had no contact with the apostolic age.

Thirteen Epistles bear the name of Paul, and claim to be in some sense his. Another, and one of the greatest, is anonymous; and though not Paul's, is yet certainly related to the Pauline circle. And still another, which bears the divergent name of Peter, has with good reason been regarded as a deliberate confirmation of the Pauline system of thought. These fifteen Epistles we propose to pass under review. But we find, further, that the Synoptic Gospels which contain much of the apostolic preaching, and the Book of *Acts* which records thoughts as well as movements of apostles, have points of historical or theological or even literary connection with several of the said Epistles. It thus becomes necessary, in determining the Pauline doctrine, to take note of nearly twenty books of Scripture. It is the intention in this volume first to exhibit the thought and mind of Paul through a study of those Epistles which by irresistible inward

evidence of unity and personality show themselves to be his; and thereafter, with the doctrine and style thus ascertained, to compare others. But the prosecution of this method has led to the differentiation of a second homogeneous group, and again, though in smaller amount, a third, and a fourth. Accordingly the fifteen Epistles divide themselves into four groups, each embodying a definite and distinctive type of primitive Christianity. Of these the second may be said almost to rival the first; and though it does not reveal in its author a personality equally great or original, it is perhaps a surer witness of the prevailing ideas of the apostles. The other two show Christianity in its stage of transference from Jewish to Gentile expounders. But all four writers belonged to one age, and were (as we suppose) personal friends, leading members of a circle of ardent associates of whom Paul was the centre or chief.

How to handle this subject in its complexity and multitudinous detail so as at once to derive and establish these positions is a question of no small difficulty. In view of limited space we propose to begin with a hypothetical assumption of conclusions, setting forth the main doctrines or marks of each group, and at the same time exhibiting internal harmony, points of interdependence, the appropriateness of the writings to the author alleged, and a reasonable view of the doctrinal positions shown in the Epistles when considered in the light of the influences that wrought on the early Church. Not on any single argument, but

on the convergence of many lines of thought and the strength of multiple harmonies, must the proof rest. For careful examination, therefore, and the cautious weighing of evidence the case is submitted.

A great step in criticism was taken when Baur isolated four Epistles as the undisputed work of Paul. This judgment concentrated attention on certain doctrines and personal characteristics. It made the image of Paul clearer by detachment and contrast. None but an occasional eccentric has since then doubted that these are the work of one master-mind, even of him who therein in no hesitating language asserts his authority to teach and to guide. But the Tübingen reconstruction was vitiated by theoretic opinion regarding the attitudes of contending factions, and by the supposition that certain writings owe their character to the deliberately reconciling influences of a later age. This theory of tendency was an error in the first intention, which has compromised the work of a race of able critics and has kept from German scholarship the crown of complete success. Baur and his followers saw that several of the so-called Epistles of Paul were by no means in the style and language of the apostle. But they too hastily concluded that the ideas were those of a later age. And they did not sufficiently realise the wealth, variety, and activity of mind that belonged to the first Christian generation.

The years in which the Churches of Antioch, Corinth, Ephesus, and a dozen other cities were founded were years of intellectual and spiritual ferment not now easily imaginable. And the outer

facts of the N.T. literature correspond with what is general experience regarding all the great periods of imaginative and creative thought. What is more manifest than that these outstanding epochs are contained within narrow limits, limits which in respect of their full fervour rarely embrace more than one generation? So it was in the ages of Pericles or Augustus or Elizabeth, in the periods of the great drama or of creative fiction or of lyric passion. So too in the great epochs of art. While there is a general continuity of effort and accomplishment, there are times of concentrated energy in which the national mind rises to unwonted heights. And from these seasons of elevated passion, these flowering days of the tree Igdrasil, come forth the works that are the permanent intellectual treasures of the race. And this law of nations has perhaps its highest illustration in the production of the N.T. Life was then lived with an intensity never before shown in spiritual things. From glowing spirits came forth the reflection of a Divine illumination. And so this little Book stands high above anything that preceded or that followed. On this general ground, therefore, it is far from likely that a century, or even half a century, was interposed between the first and the last of the masterpieces that accompanied the planting of Christianity.

Another erroneous tendency of criticism is to subdivide, relegating the parts to successive generations. Thus in short Epistles some can find the original and additions and revision or insertion. Such things might happen in commonplace times,

should a sufficient motive exist; but to apply these standards to the N.T. is to judge the living by the dead. Works of rude ages may be mingled and modified, but in classical times such confusion is unthinkable. A compilation like the Pentateuch, which embodies the law and history of centuries, is a consolidated treatise which may contain accretions from many pens. The histories of Matthew and Luke are based on prior materials which may have been revised, summarised, or simply transferred. But an essay or epistle of high purpose and art should not be lightly thought of as a compilation. Scholars to-day, like schoolmen of old, can spin cobwebs which clear air and commonsense are sufficient to disperse. The actual conditions and requirements and methods are what we have to realise. And herein the traditional interpreter comes short. For the old spirit is lost, and the old ways are forgotten; and a conventional conservatism is formed, with eyes ever directed from the light. But the truth-seeker must disregard both custom and fancy, being assured that nothing is so greatly to be welcomed as the facts of reality.

We are now able to look at Paul in a larger light than was possible half a century ago, both as he is in himself (theologian, moralist, missionary, leader, man), and in relation to the ideas or movements with which he had to co-operate or contend. Our knowledge is fuller; and our minds are more habituated to historical reconstruction. We are also able to take a more accurate view of the Epistles than was possible under the old theory of inerrancy.

Authorship, we know, had not quite the same meaning to the apostles as to us. They were not craftsmen in the art of letters, zealous and jealous of lasting reputation. The feelings that impelled them exalted them, and they were not influenced by the "last infirmity of noble minds." Of Paul's writings none, except possibly *Romans*, was consciously written for general and permanent use. The others are occasional letters called forth by some local controversy or some urgent requirement of the hour. They arose out of the circumstances of his active career. That career when in its meridian was suddenly arrested, and, after a period of suspense, was closed in martyrdom. Only then, when the great personality was for ever removed, would any attempt have been made to gather and preserve what he had written. And in so troubled a generation even that was hardly possible. What we have extant, therefore, is only a small part of an extensive correspondence; though, being addressed to important Churches, it may contain a fairly full image of his mind. And it has come through the hands of editors who may have been commissioned to adapt the documents to ecclesiastical use. The editor would have been a former disciple; and neither he nor the Church which possessed the letter could have imagined that Paul's memory would be wronged, or the cause of truth compromised, by any modification of form that might seem to make the document more truly representative of its author, or more exactly adapted to the permanent purposes of edification. But further,

some of the Letters are professedly penned by an amanuensis; and in most of them a companion is associated with the apostle in the authorship. We cannot therefore claim to have in every case the *ipsissima verba* of Paul. The amanuensis may have been a clerk writing to dictation or a colleague free to use his own power of expression. And it may be quite possible for us to trace, in accidental terminology, the influence of a second mind. In such suggestions of possibility no ethical question is involved. They are matters of practical arrangement. Writing to the Galatians or Philippians letters of deep feeling, Paul's concern would have been for the substance of the communication and the immediate impression; though doubtless in unfolding his theology in detail he would have been careful alike of thought and of word.

Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ* noted points of connection and correspondence between the Epistles and the *Acts*, drawing plausible inferences which satisfied two generations. But the argument scarcely affects the critic who supposes that a disciple of Paul, conversant with the historical situation, wrote the Epistle in the name of his master for the attestation to another generation of his master's doctrine. The problem as now conceived is more subtle and complex than it was a century ago; while on the other hand, questions of good faith which perplexed the older rationalism now scarcely enter into serious criticism. The successor of Paley must examine the Epistles so as to be assured whether or not they are the spontaneous utterances of an intimate and

anxious correspondence, or whether they may not be messages of instruction and declamation framed in epistolary guise and directed towards the erring opinions or lagging organisation of a later day. Do they reveal personality? Do we feel beneath the unequal flow of sentences the ardent throbbings of a human heart? Do they carry on their face the situation of author and receiver, so that we can mentally realise the community addressed, with its characteristics or controversies in doctrine and practice, and can see the soul of the writer overflowing, through forms become familiar, in language of affection, encouragement, or reproof? Are all the group united by the same mode of thought, showing the consistency of a definite school, or the same cast of expression characteristic of a tribe or race? Have they the same fundamental ideas and conceptions, the same or similar terms and mannerisms of speech? Intellectual growth or adaptation we are prepared for, but can we recognise a sameness, a persistence of mind and purpose, such as we find in the writings of any favourite author, a Johnson or Emerson, a Macaulay or Carlyle? Again, regarding personal points, is Ephesus, where Paul lived so long, revealed to us in its Epistle as Corinth is? Is the spirit of Paul manifested in 1 *Timothy* as in *Philippians* or *Philemon*? Do we find in the Thessalonian or Pastoral Epistles the fundamental doctrines—reconciliation, the righteousness of God, the presence or power of the risen Christ? Are the immutable truths the same in all? Such are some of the questions which in a hundred

forms, general or detailed, present themselves for settlement.

Two theories that are widely held and that are too readily accepted by conservative teachers, in the belief that thereby the difficulties of a complicated situation are met, I wish here to refer to. One is that Paul's mind was in a process of continuous change, and that his literary period must be divided into four distinct parts. The Epistles, it is said, represent four successive stages of his mental growth, and give us four separate phases of his thought. Thus thirty years ago Lightfoot wrote: "It is a generally recognised fact that St. Paul's Epistles fall chronologically into four groups, separated from one another by an interval of five years roughly speaking, and distinguished by their internal character." This view is still put forth; and its effect may be studied in such an essay as Professor Charles' article on Eschatology, wherein he imputes to the apostle a very surprising fickleness.

The first group consists of the two Thessalonian Epistles. But between Paul's first visit to Thessalonica and the close of his personal freedom not more than six years had to pass, six years not of a growing mind but of a man past middle age who had been a Christian for nearly twenty years before the date when as a missionary he first crossed into Europe. If four phases are later than that journey, how many are earlier? The Epistles themselves will be examined in their proper place, and we shall see in them traces of ecclesiastical organisation and of evil habits con-

tracted which are scarcely conceivable of the virgin days of the evangel; perhaps also unmistakable marks that the fall of Jerusalem is already past. Again, there is the negative fact of the entire absence of Paul's characteristic theology, of legal and forensic conceptions, or of life in a risen Saviour. But, says the critic, these letters are tentative compositions, "primer epistles," as Dr. Bruce called them, the productions of a neophyte. For our part we think that Paul learned his legalism at the feet of Gamaliel; but in any case it is not the teaching of these Epistles, but the criticism itself, that is rudimentary and crude.

Paul's "second stage" produced the "four great Epistles"—Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians. The theory, which at least does homage to the homogeneity of the group, is that a controversy regarding the law sprang up, raged for two or three years, sharpened Paul's intellect, and called forth these earnest declarations. This supposition contains two fallacies. Questions of rites and customs are not occasional amongst peoples to whose normal teachers religion is but another name for praxis. And Paul's special emphasis on the term "law" is due solely to his rabbinical training thirty years before and his Pharisaic cast of mind. The supposed controversy (though in fact he had no inter-Christian controversy except with the retrograde and ignorant Galatians) was simply the old enmity of priest and scribe to new and progressive ideas, which had united them against Jesus, and on account of which His followers, Stephen long before

and Paul himself and many others, suffered martyrdom. But secondly, these matters of the law are not the main characteristics of this group of Epistles. In them we find Paul's doctrines of propitiation and reconciliation, of justification and sanctification, of an indwelling Spirit and quickening power, of the redemption of the body and the transformation into the Divine image; in them also the richness of spiritual experience, the new ethics of love and service, the glory of Christian character. They contain the apostle's life-long faith.

The third group contains, bracketed as Epistles of the Captivity, *Ephesians*, *Colossians*, *Philippians*, with *Philemon*. If these are the homogeneous productions of a new stage, is it not surprising to find in one a pleroma of divinity (Col. 1^{19}) and in another a kenosis of the same (Phil. 2^{7}) predicated regarding the Incarnate life; or again, to find Eph. full and Col. empty of doctrines of the Spirit; or to find the three in three different literary styles?

Finally, the placing of the Pastorals in a fourth stage requires the hypothesis of an acquittal (contrary to the natural meaning of Acts 20^{25-38}) and a second captivity. But that is a small part of the case. In these later Epistles the doctrine of the Cross has receded, and with it the idea of Christ as the power of a risen life. And we are to suppose that from the heights of imaginative eloquence in Ephesians, from contemplation of the heavenlies and of the Bride of Christ, and an ethic based on Divine actions and ideas, the apostle has all at once descended to the quiet practical piety and prudence

of 1 Timothy. Tender and true are these Pastorals; but if they are Paul's, then "all he was is overworn." The theory of the four stages, as in these Epistles shown, is at variance with the probabilities of natural evolution; and if it were not unreal it would compromise the authority of the man who was the victim of changes so marked. Far more probable is it that Paul's gospel (as it is distinctively called in Rom. 2^{16}, and as it is elaborately unfolded in Romans), is the system of thought which took shape in his mind in Arabia, which he preached in Syria and Cilicia, which he upheld in Jerusalem, which he carried through Asia Minor and Greece, and for which finally he suffered death.

The other theory, which is more seriously affecting the thought of to-day, is Paul's alleged Hellenism. The Epistles, or some of them, contain terms that belong to Greek rather than Jewish life. Even in the sphere of thought there are (it is said) elements akin to, probably derived from, the philosophy or theosophy of Greece. And it may be admitted that traces are to be found of Platonic and of Stoic influence. Accordingly the suggestion is made that from Platonism Paul reinforced and modified his Christianity. This is set forth as natural. He was brought up in the capital of Cilicia, a centre of Greek culture; in school at Tarsus he must have inhaled an atmosphere of Pagan philosophy; though all his life he must have been affected by contact with Greek thought.

Against this we have Paul's own words, "a

Hebrew of Hebrews, a zealous Pharisee," born indeed in Tarsus but educated in Jerusalem, "according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers" (Phil. 3^5, Acts 22^3). The testimony of these passages is clear. They imply the existence of cosmopolitan Jews, and they repudiate for Paul any such association. We remember also that after the Tarsus days Paul bitterly withstood Stephen, and passionately burned to destroy the more liberal of the Christians. And we find in Paul's central theology—in the curse of the law and the propitiatory Death and the quickening Spirit and the Resurrection power—no trace whatever of Greek influence. No doubt Paul knew Greek, and something of Greek life. In a sense Hellenism was everywhere. Greek culture had in various forms spread beyond Greater Greece over the whole Roman world, and could be acquired in Jerusalem and in Tarsus as well as in Ephesus or Alexandria. But the effect of diffused culture on men of another race, reared from infancy in ancient and still living beliefs, is entirely superficial. Types are, by seclusion and studious inculcation, preserved intact in the midst of surrounding hostile influences. Such, according to tradition, was Paul's lot through the guardianship of a pious mother. He was nourished on the Law and the Fathers. His mind enthusiastically received the lessons of his teachers and the teaching of the Scriptures. To him they were the voice of God; and all other systems were but the noises of confusion. The rabbinical mode of thought was woven into the texture of his soul. It

survived his conversion and every experience of his life. He was a Pharisee to the end. And through him the forms of rabbinical thought have had a second existence in the Church of Christ.

But, it is said, his mind underwent an expansion which broadened his intellectual outlook. And it is true that from strict Judaism he was emancipated. Questions of the Law gave place to the knowledge of a higher law. His mind received an illumination which produced a revolution. But this new world of thought and idea did not come from Greece. Its effect was only to corroborate his faith in the exclusive revelation of Israel. He was led onward, not outward. The law brought him to Christ, in whom its own purpose ceased. In his new knowledge questions of race and race-customs vanished; all distinctions that were of the flesh or the form ceased to be. By faith in Christ all races had access to Redemption; and thus a new universal spiritual order was seen to arise. Did the apostle reach this goal through philosophy? Assuredly not. Philosophy is the theme of his scorn. Philosophers are the least hopeful and promising of men. Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? This seems to us the natural view of the man derived from the main Epistles; confirmed by his belief in the infallibility of the Scriptures and of O.T. inspiration, illustrated also in the temper or spirit of the man. Where is there any trace of the broad and genial humanism that tolerates wide divergence and readily receives new ideas in him who wrote, "if an angel from heaven

preach any other doctrine . . . let him be accursed"?

It is at least time to ask our new critics what specific doctrines or opinions, what theories of the schools or of popular religion, Paul derived from Greece—what and where they are. Thus will they help towards a solution of the problem. We find in Bousset's new book, *What is Religion?* (chap. vii), the following summary of what is common to Paul and Plato: "The sharp distinction between the material concrete world and the spiritual world; pessimist judgment of this world; the proclamation that the better higher self of man lies captive in the bonds and fetters of the flesh; the intense longing for (physical) freedom from these bonds," as in Rom. 7^{24}. Surely it is regrettable that philosophers are so often in the clouds. Paul certainly taught that all men are sinful; but we know no other doctrine of his that is referred to in these clauses. The phrase in Rom. 7^{24}, "body of this death," is one of several in that Epistle that suggest a reminiscence of Greek literature, and we indicate our explanations below. But the phrase is not specially Platonic or even philosophical. The comparison of a body to a tomb is a commonplace of systems that teach the transmigration of souls. But the meaning in Paul seems entirely different. Another writer, Dr. Bacon, in his very able *Story of St. Paul*, accepts both of the theories we have mentioned—the four-staged development and the Hellenic mixture,—and with curious results. He finds in the *Ephesians* the Eleusinian mysteries, though he

has not discovered what in that Epistle is called a "mystery"; he represents Paul as making heathen theosophy the "framework" of his Gospel, and even imagines that the reading in his Roman prison of some pagan parchment was sufficient both to dislodge his former conceptions (*i.e.* the second stage) and to give the apostle a new world of ideas which (in his third stage) he could palm off as Christ's. So unstable does he find the foundations, so double-edged is every false weapon of defence.

Yet the fact of a certain element of Greek influence remains; and the analysis in this volume may help to put the question in a new form. There are first the elements of vocabulary. Most of the authors of the N.T. reveal differences due partly to education and partly to natural cast of thought. But again, these writers of Jewish race are themselves modified by experiences among Gentiles. Even Paul may have adopted some words from those he endeavoured to evangelise. And again, we have in one chief writer a purely Gentile element. The linguistic problem is thus itself intricate and uncertain. There are, secondly, the variations of thought, and especially the presence of ideas that seem to be suggested by the religion or the philosophy of Greece. Of this much will, however, be found in the already existing Græco-Jewish literature, and may have found its way into the N.T. either from the Apocrypha or from the discussions of the time. This so-called Greek influence is perhaps of two kinds. One of these is philosophical and may be vaguely called Platonic,

by which we mean that it is akin to the modes of thought then cultivated in Alexandria. The other belongs to practical life, and is akin to the ethical and social conceptions of Stoicism. The former will be found almost exclusively in the second of the four groups marked below. The latter is divided between that group and what may be traced to Luke. But in Paulinism pure and unexpanded, as we have it in the first group, we doubt if any extraneous influence (except occasional terminology not due perhaps to the author) can anywhere be traced. But again, these semi-platonic influences of our second group do not pertain to the region of fundamental and creative ideas. They do not affect the interpretation of Christ—His Life or Death or Resurrection. At the highest they may aid in setting forth His celestial glory or in giving fuller expression to the absolute character of Christianity. The terms of ethical didacticism that here and there remind us of the Stoics teach no new doctrine of duty and add no problem of origins. Moreover, their purpose is adaptation ; they are the words of men who are endeavouring to present truth in forms and language familiar and venerable to their readers.

The argument of this Essay rests exclusively on internal data ; mainly on theological ideas and literary style. The latter argument is of course subsidiary ; and one seems to overhear the reader discount its value or despise its use. Yet no one has difficulty in distinguishing the styles of great writers, or of men trained in different tribes of

thought. There is to-day a general sameness in contemporary writers of the second rank; in essayists or novelists who have been reared in the same modes of thinking or expression, have breathed the same intellectual or social atmosphere, and have rubbed each other into a colourless uniformity. But these remarks do not apply to an age of new ideas where each separately strives to see and know the truth. Nor do they ever apply to men of the first rank. No sentence of Livy strays into Tacitus, of Gibbon into Grote, or of Macaulay into Carlyle. Original writers are individual and unique. And schools historically distinct have their distinctive marks. We have no difficulty in differentiating Paul and John; nor are they more distinct from each other than is *Hebrews* from both. But this critical discrimination may yet lead us to far fuller results.

The question is twofold. There is the lower linguistic aspect, which may indicate education or nationality, but not individual character or cast of mind. And there is the higher literary or artistic aspect seen in the general plan, or in the use of imagery, or in the construction of sentences. Our distinctions of the concise or the copious, the intellectual or the emotional, the elaborate or the simple are all to be found in one or other of the Epistles. Thus in the first group (below) we have frequency of antithesis and an entire absence of redundancy, in the second group we have precisely the reverse. But the argument from theological position is of a more important and more decisive character. And this is true not only where doctrines

differ, and writers belong to divergent or distinct schools of thought, but also where the teaching is essentially the same. One may be Pharisaic, another Levitical, one schooled in popular wisdom and another moulded in the politics of the empire; and all may give us in their different moulds portions of the same gold of truth. Similarly of ethics; one teacher may base morality on the power of Christ, another on obedience to God, another on maxims of prudence or principles of right. Differences that divide modern theologians: conceptions of the Divine Fatherhood, substitutionary and moral theories of the Atonement, varying views of the Kingdom of God, or of the Second Advent, already exist side by side in the N.T. Epistles, and are sufficient to show diversity of authorship.

It is one thing to arrive at general results, another to reconstruct with final conclusions. We may be sure that some particular Epistles have no stamp of Paul's personality, and only partially express his distinctive doctrines. Yet this is but the beginning. Was the Epistle written by a disciple at his side, or, more leisurely, from notes which the master dictated? Or was it written after his death to keep alive in the growing Church the true form of his teaching, or at some crisis of a community to counteract the entrance of erroneous doctrine? Such questions are manifold. We require to know not only the mind or type of the supposed author, but also the ideas and controversies of the hour, the modes of thought prevalent in province and race, the limitations

imposed by the audience addressed, the circumstances that call forth particular declarations. The method has to be applied with caution. To the man in the street theological distinctions or literary subtleties are by no means evident; while the man in the classroom has round him the strewed wrecks of obsolete theories. Yet the world does move; literatures do reveal their origin and growth; and though truth lies at the bottom of a well, the quiet seeker who looks steadfastly through clear water will not always look in vain.

Here, then, let us state our results, to be regarded for the present as a hypothesis explaining the variations or divergences of thought and style. There are four groups which we assign respectively to Paul and the three best known of his younger associates and interpreters. The differences in the writings correspond to differences in the birth, training, and experience of the men.

First, or strictly Pauline Group.

1 Corinthians (except 15^{20-34}), 2 Corinthians (except 6^{14}–7^{1}, 13^{11-14}); Romans 1–11, Galatians, Philippians, and Romans $16^{1-16.\ 21-24}$.

These alone are Paul's: they are unique, the image of a unique personality. Even these, apparently in an increasing degree, reveal in the region of expression the influence of a Greek associate.

Second, or Exhortation Group.

Ephesians, Hebrews, 1 Peter, 1 Thessalonians 4–5, 2 Thessalonians 1–2; Romans 12, 13, 15; 1 Corinthians 15^{20-34}, 2 Corinthians 6^{14}–7^{1}; the Gospel of Matthew in its final editing, and perhaps slight elements in Acts.

These belong to the ministry of exhortation, and are further distinguished from the apostolic group by the priestly character of the doctrinal and moral conceptions. If the unity of the group is established it will follow that the authorship belongs to Silas.

THIRD, OR TIMOTHEAN GROUP.

1 Thessalonians 1–3, 2 Thessalonians 3, Colossians, Philemon; probably also Romans 14, and the final editorship of Mark's Gospel.

The style in this group is that of a disciple who deals in his master's manner with new questions, reproducing thoughts and words of the apostle. If the former group is by Silas, it will follow that this supplementary work is by Timothy. The connections with *Mark* are important rather than numerous. And notwithstanding high recent authority, we believe that the copy of this Gospel used by the other synoptics was not the final edition.

FOURTH, OR PASTORAL GROUP.

2 Timothy, 1 Timothy, Titus.

The same writer is the author of the doxology, Rom. 16^{25-27}, and probably of many terms and some clauses in all Paul's Epistles. We show that the writer was a Greek, and that the Pastoral Epistles have many points of connection with *Luke* and *Acts*. It is therefore probable that the author is Luke.

If this division is correct we can see the body of thought represented by Paul dividing itself after his death into two main channels, a Jewish and a

Gentile, while between them, and closer to the thought of the apostle, is the lesser stream represented by our third group. Questions of the relations of these groups to each other, and to the general movement of Christianity, necessarily arise. Are they interdependent or independent? Under what influences do they move away in different directions from the original Pauline type? And under what circumstances or for what ends were they called into being at all? The view prevalent among critics, that the Pastoral Epistles represent the situation in the early part of the second century is, of course, incompatible with the Lucan authorship. On the other hand, if our view is sustained, the Pastorals are brought up to a period contemporary with, or rather prior to, that of our second group. Luke, when Paul died, must have been about forty years of age. For a period extending to about fifteen years he had been associated with the apostle. He was both a missionary and a man of letters; and if henceforward his chief work is the writing of historic records, we can see, in the Pastorals, the continuance therewith of an active interest in Christian work such as won for him an important position and influence in Asia Minor and in Greece. Much more mysterious is Silas, whose departure from Corinth was unrecorded. Probably he travelled in various lands. And now he appears as interpreter first of Peter and then of Paul, while, like Luke, he compiles and enlarges a Gospel history. His style, as well as his thought, is widely different

from Luke's, notwithstanding the extensive use in both of a common terminology. And the outlook is different, for the Epistles which we assign to Silas are charged with the presence of trial and the expectation of coming change. But this also, like the difference in style, may find its explanation less in public events than in inward disposition and type. The story that the First Gospel was found buried with Barnabas in his Cypriote tomb may suggest that Silas co-operated also with that elder "son of exhortation"; the two men being drawn together by community of thought and sympathy due to priestly origin and prophetic talent, as well as to earnest labour and endeavour in the service of their Master. Our object, however, is not speculation, but to show, on the one hand, that there are three unmistakable groups of writings, and that corresponding to these we have three names,—two representing the two best types of the Jewish religion and the other a pious and cultured Gentile earnestly embracing the new faith, and eager to aid in giving it access to the nations. The Timothean group will then appear as supplementary. And the next step will be to compare our second group with other less closely related writings: Jude, the Apocalypse of John, James, 2 Peter; and all with the final harmony of apostolic thought in the Gospel and Epistle of John.

Some final points arising out of the freedom of this analysis seem to invite attention. First, how are we to view the claims to authorship apparently asserted in the Epistles themselves? To draw the

line between strict accuracy and literary convention is by no means easy, and again between convention and deception. But in our handling of the literature of a distant age the first requirement is to know the conditions, ideas, and standards of the place or time. We have to transport ourselves out of our conventions into the light and life of other days. The scribes sat in the seat of Moses, the prophets pronounced the word of Jehovah; and anciently as now there were the false and the true.

The situation was universally understood. If an Epistle is a letter in the strict sense, as one of the longest of all (1 Cor.) clearly is, then it is the writing of its signatory. But if it is a dogmatic exposition or a pastoral exhortation, with nothing of personal intimacy or benefit, then it may be a letter only in form, and will have to be judged by more complex rules. The epistolary guise may be chosen in a particular age to add interest to a treatise of instruction, as in our own times it has been used to clothe a work of fiction. Or, if we suppose that the readers understood all these Epistles to emanate directly from Paul, we may compare them with official despatches issued by the head of a department, written by unknown subordinates. The names of Paul and Peter are used by disciples who set forth the doctrines of their teacher, assuredly with no intention of deception. Or if, as in Colossians, two names appear on an Epistle and the style is clearly not that of the first, it is surely our duty to consider whether we have not the writing of the second, in harmony with the

mind of the first. To understand what was intended is a primary task of criticism. But the limits of elasticity in that ardent first century are not easily determinable; and it is perhaps in the case of that mildest of men, the beloved physician of his circle, that we have the boldest departure from our modern rules of authorship. Harnack has recently shown that the Third Gospel and the *Acts* were written by one man. A wonderful and apparently gratifying discovery! But where was the moral consciousness of those who formerly believed that the *Acts* opened with an assertion of gratuitous fraudulence? Luke was not capable of anything like that. Yet he was a Gentile, versed in the art of Xenophon; and to him it would have seemed a natural duty to clothe his outlines with flesh and blood, and to amplify his narrative with speeches and details true in the spirit rather than the letter. He had the literary instinct, the active imagination, the power of easy and apt expression. If in 1 Timothy and in Titus we have a wide departure from what seems the natural law in the setting forth of authorship, the explanation may be found in the quite different conceptions natural to a cultured Greek.

Another point is the possibility of interpolation. It is possible that occasionally a clause or phrase may have been inserted by an editor for elucidation, or again a gloss may have slipped into the text. And in the case of Paul's Epistles, which were not written for publication and not collected in their author's lifetime, and often in thought not clear to

the simple reader, we might expect such clauses more readily than elsewhere. Probably, however, none bearing on doctrine will be found. And indeed, in strictly literary and theological essays, such as Hebrews or Ephesians or Romans, he would be a bold editor who would venture to enlarge or modify the text. But in 2 Cor. 6^{14}–7^{1} there is a paragraph as irrelevant to its context as is John $8^{1.\ 11}$, and in a style wholly unlike that of the Epistle; so that criticism has to consider whether it is a misplaced paragraph, or an editorial insertion, or an accidental adherence. This paragraph we find to be in a style either that of the second group or akin thereto. But in 1 Cor. $15^{20.\ 28}$ we have ventured to maintain that the editor has deliberately enlarged the argument; and in the verses that follow, which at most seem only partially Pauline, we have an almost solitary instance of language betraying itself. "I fought with beasts at Ephesus,"—the words "at Ephesus" were not likely to have been written "from Ephesus" (as 1 Cor. was), still less to have been written before the fight took place (2 Cor. 1^{8}). But they may well be Paul's, spoken or written on a later occasion. Once more, in ver. 29 there is a mysterious reference to a magical use of Baptism for the dead which sound Protestants may not regret to regard as editorial. And if in these two passages an unusual editorial freedom is assumed, shall we not remember that the editor may himself have been a leader of men, a founder of churches, a writer of authoritative scriptures?

But these cases probably stand alone. It is the

disease of criticism to be ever resolving into sources or analysing into parts. Dovetailed paragraphs are found in short as well as in long Epistles. And generally speaking, when a difficulty is encountered a far-fetched solution is at hand. This failure of criticism is seen in the case of Colossians, where the critic, finding the two facts of Pauline resemblance and late date, proceeds to separate the original and the later part, drawing his lines between vitally connected sentences and even through the middle of a carefully constructed period. But before the true explanation difficulties soon withdraw themselves. The requirement of the critic of the Epistles or Gospels is not imagination loaded with extensive learning, but sure vision cognisant of truth and sensitive to difference. Such vision presupposes cautious examination and wise restraint. The confusion that still exists in regard to the Epistles is due to the consciousness that much which is traditionally ascribed to Paul cannot really be directly his, and that the alternative theories are extravagant. But perhaps when a clear idea has been formed of associates or successors who combined with the same religious interests a different type of mind, different training and experience, it will be realised that the key of the problem is in our hands. And again, it may teach us to distinguish essence from accident, and to seek the central realities when we realise that forms which in modern times have ranged themselves in controversial opposition once existed side by side, in cordial harmony, within the maternal bosom of the Apostolic Church.

CHAPTER II

THE FOUNDATIONS

WHILE the facts out of which Christianity arose were new, the ideas in the light of which those facts were interpreted were by no means then for the first time apprehended. The apostolic founders nourished their own minds on the sacred literature of the past. While they talked of the "beginning of the Gospel," that Gospel itself was not a beginning but a culmination. And the most daring of them looked back with pride on the institutions and history of their race (Rom. 9^4). They were now filled with the "spirit of revelation," but they rejoiced to find that the ideas which possessed and animated them had already at a great crisis of their history been uttered by the prophets of Jehovah. The profound intuitions of these teachers of the past and the marvellous coincidences of anticipation and fact led to the divination that "the testimony of Jesus was the spirit of prophecy." His work, His experiences, His character, His thoughts seemed already expressed, and His image seemed to start from any page. They saw that "not unto themselves," but unto a distant time, did the ancient seers minister

the ways of God. And as these prophets had searched to ascertain what age or kind of age was to experience God's fuller guidance and help, so the apostolic preachers searched those prophets to discover what they might from that illuminated mountain range that lay behind. The consequence is that the N.T. writings are saturated with O.T. quotation. These quotations are sometimes merely illustrative, but they are often much more. They may indicate the source of an idea or the interpretation of an event. An exposition of Paulinism may therefore properly recall how this body of ideas was anticipated or promoted in a spiritual crisis long before. Paul after his conversion went "into Arabia." He revised his rabbinical conceptions in the light of the history that extended from Abraham to Christ. He studied the sacred Scriptures with the new light which from God had shone on his soul.

While the ethical ideas of Christianity are to be found in the earliest literary prophets (in Isaiah or Micah), the more general conceptions of doctrine first clearly appear in the epoch of the exile. In that time of travail new visions and expectations saw the light, new thoughts and new hopes were born. We may regard many of these as gathered or crystallised in the expression a "new covenant." This designation we find repeatedly in Jeremiah, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and Ezekiel. It is accepted and confirmed by Christ. Paul repeats it in 1 Cor. 11^{25}, 2 Cor. 3^{3}, Gal. 4^{24}. And in the Epistle to the Hebrews it is a dominant note, expounded on the basis of Jeremiah. "Covenant" expresses

the idea of religion as a mutual obligation between man and God. It had been used to express the relationship of God towards patriarchs and founders (Adam and Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the monarchy and the priesthood), which contained Divine promises conditional on the obedience and faith of man. A covenant assumes the presence of God sanctioning the institutions, directing the historical life of the people. But the special covenant was the establishing under Moses of national religion when on Mount Sinai the tables of the law were given and the people took the oath of allegiance to Jehovah their God. In that solemn hour of history, under the overwhelming presence of their Maker and Deliverer, a new nation was born; and the first stage of spiritual united religion was witnessed. But the Mosaic revelation was the beginning, not the end. The O.T. religion was one of gradual delivery as well as of slow and gradual comprehension. In an eventful history of successes and failures, of prophetic warnings and bitter experiences, we see Israel led onward through life's complications and disasters to conceptions not unworthy of the manhood of a great race. By lessons of life and by messages from God this nation was being disciplined to become, in spiritual heredity, a mother and instructress of nations. The culminating era of the Exile called forth what was deepest and tenderest in the soul. Away from home and hallowed association, from the city of their tradition and the temple of their worship, in contact also with the great world powers of their

time and the moving masses of humanity, they whose minds had been narrowed and hardened in contempt of the Gentile world entered on a new expansion. They learned that the earth was broad and the heavens high, and that God's mercies and judgments were over all. The sixth century B.C. was a period of intellectual and religious awakening in many lands: amongst the Persians, whose prophet Zoroaster was perhaps living; in India, where the Buddha was about to be born; in Greece, where philosophy was beginning to dawn. The exiles had much to see, with leisure to reflect. They discovered anew what Isaiah and all their seers had been insisting on—the inwardness of all true religion and true morals. And with this spirituality they realised also the universality, and therewith the permanence, of all moral and religious principle. From these fundamental conditions they rose to the double consciousness that they, the adopted people, would yet find themselves restored to conditions of life in their own land happier than those of the past, and also that through trial they were being trained for a new Divine service, namely, to be God's light and salvation unto the ends of the earth. These foundation truths were learned, and if they were not largely acted on they were recorded for the inspiration of a later day.

They began to talk of a New Covenant. The Old Dispensation had resulted in failure. Notwithstanding the throne of David and all the superiority on which they relied, they were broken up; their national unity was destroyed; their capital was

captured and their temple demolished; their leaders were prisoners, and the flower of their race was helpless in distant captivity. They had broken the Covenant. Sins individual and national had brought on them the judgment of God. But though they had forfeited favour for a time they were still sure that they were pre-eminently the people of God. He would not finally forsake them. This is the conviction that burns and glows in the closing chapters of ISAIAH. God (we are told) shares the sufferings of His people. In their affliction He is afflicted, He has graven Jerusalem on the palms of His hands. His love therefore necessitates redemption. For His name's sake and for His loving purpose He will regather the scattered flock and rebuild the city. And the people will return and with new vows enter on a truer service.

But they would return with enlarged mind. New conceptions of obedience, of spirituality, of evil, of the uses of affliction, of the mysteries of providence, of international relationships, of the condescending love of God and of His self-identification with His people, have taken possession of their minds, renewing their ideas of redemption and of duty. They have given shape to the vision of a suffering Saviour. And from the fountain of grace flow new thoughts of moral and religious life; of the supremacy of goodness, of the elevation of the individual, of the oneness before God of all. They were conscious of transition, of an old order changing, yielding place to new that God might in other and higher ways fulfil Himself. They dreamt

that the knowledge of God would soon fill the whole earth, and that His spirit would become the possession of mankind. Hence the conception of a new covenant. And in those thoughts that show the water-mark of Israel's spiritual history, and in the books of Scripture that interpret them, rather than in contemporary moods and movements that may give a superficial colouring to some N.T. paragraphs, slight touches of the local and the temporary, critics who desire a more familiar knowledge of the minds of the apostles should make their search. Only general points can here be noticed.

First, the New Covenant will be a covenant of grace. It is a gospel of forgiveness: "their sins, their iniquities will I remember no more" (Jer. 31). It is a "covenant of peace" (Ezek. 34^{25} 37^{26}); affording security and favour (Isa. 54^{10}); a covenant of kindness and mercy (Isa. 55^{3} $54^{8.10}$). That is to say, the Covenant is a restoration of friendship, separations being removed and defilements cleansed, so that active love and mutual service become possible. The Covenant broken by man's sin is restored by the mercy of God, who to make friendship or fellowship possible removes the barriers of transgression and puts away the burden of guilt. This is the starting-point of higher religion, the assurance of forgiveness and a state of grace. But these statements derive emphasis from many more, from the pictures of prosperity and re-union with God, from language of redemption and salvation, from the acceptable year of the Lord in which the

broken hearts are healed and the captives set free.

Secondly, the Covenant is inward. I will write my law and put my fear in their hearts (Jer. 31^{33} 32^{40}). That is to say, morality and religion will be rooted in man's nature and made directive of thought and feeling as well as of outer life. This is an essential advance, anticipative of the Sermon on the Mount. And the application is manifold. "All shall know Me." The individual becomes responsible. The inner nature must be rectified. Motive, impulse, aim, intention are all involved in the action. Conduct must be in sincerity. Worship must be in spirit. Truth in the inward parts is the essential requisite.

Thirdly, this inward Covenant is in its nature permanent. A frequent epithet is "everlasting" (Isa. 54^{10} 55^{3}, Jer. 32^{40}, Ezek. 16^{60}), often repeated in Hebrews. The temporary elements are superseded. The Covenant is based on unchanging facts and conditions. The local regulation, the external precept, the rudimentary direction are gone. The Father of spirits speaks to men that have reached the maturity of manhood. What is true now is therefore true so long as the same conditions of existence last. The Covenant, like the word or the counsel of God, must endure for ever.

A second source of N.T. illustration is to be found in the prophecy regarding the servant of Jehovah. Here also we have the term covenant in the repeated description, "a covenant of the people" (Isa. 42^{6} 49^{8}). The person and character

of Christ is found in chap. 42, His ministry in 49, and His atoning death in 53. The "covenant of peace" derives new significance from the words, "the chastisement of our peace was upon Him." And students of the mystery of the Cross found illumination in such texts as "He was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities," His "soul an offering for sin," the "Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." In this Deutero-Isaiah also we have descriptions of Jehovah as a Redeemer and Saviour, in words tender as Christ's sayings of the Father, and of the restored Israel in language that seemed chosen to set forth the glory of the Church (60, etc.). The descriptions of the sin of man (59) and of the freeness and fulness of grace (55) have here their classical expression; and most doctrines of Christianity have their suggestion or illustration. Even the Pauline problem of the righteousness of God, however immediately pharisaic in form, must find here a key to its ultimate solution. The identity of God's righteousness and His salvation finds expression explicitly or implicitly throughout the whole book (41^{10} 42^{6} $45^{8.\ 21}$ 46^{13} 50^{8} $51^{5.\ 8}$ 53^{11} 54^{14} $59^{16.\ 17}$ 61^{10} 62^{1}). Here also we find occasionally the juridic manner characteristic of Paul, as well as the opposite manner, where in language of beauty and tenderness the heart of God is portrayed. In addition to all this there are general texts that reappear in the language of Paul, showing themselves woven into the texture of his mind. Such are $45^{9.\ 23}$ 50^{8} 52^{7} etc.

Not without reason and not inaptly has

this book been called the Gospel in the Old Testament.

Next, let us note uses of the word "Spirit" now for the first time clearly employed, as in modern usage, in connection with personal spiritual life. The Spirit of God (which in former times seems to have denoted physical force) is now (carrying forward the thought of Isa. 11^2) used of His mental or moral nature: "they vexed His Holy Spirit" (Isa. 63^{10}). This Spirit is given to man for mental illumination and the creation of a new character. Thus in Ezek. $36^{26.27}$, "I will put My Spirit upon you, and cause you to walk in My statutes." "I will give a new heart and a new spirit." To the same effect is Ps. 51, "Create in me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me." In Isaiah God's Spirit is as a flood of blessing, comparable to water on the thirsty and floods on the dry ground (44^3); it anoints the prophet (or the Messiah) to preach good tidings, to bind the broken-hearted (61^1); and again, the Covenant is thus defined, "My Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth for ever" (59^{21}). In Zech. 12^{10} God's Spirit is a Spirit of grace and supplication. Finally, in Joel (of uncertain date) it is poured on all classes of humanity, and will confer on the humblest worshipper religious intuition and knowledge. Thus we have in connection with the bestowal of the Spirit under the New Covenant such ideas as (1) inward regeneration (Ezek., Ps. 51), (2) spiritual enlightenment (Isa. 59,

Joel), (3) a condition of grace or favour (Isa. 44^5 61^1) which brings healing and bliss, and (4) the power of walking according to God's statutes (Ezek. 36, cf. Jer. 31^{31}).

Closely allied is the conception of the Word as a permanent source of instruction and inspiration. "My words which I have put in thy mouth shall not depart out of thy mouth . . . for ever." Human life perishes like the flowers of summer, but "the word of our God shall stand for ever." And it is powerful as well as permanent, "it shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please" (Isa. 40^8 55^{11} 59^{21}). In the first quoted passage the word is identified with the Spirit; and we may infer that in the prophet's view the purpose served in the Old Dispensation by the word of prophecy would be fulfilled under the New Covenant by the abiding Spirit. This line of thought scarcely appears in Paul (first group). But in the second group it is frequent both in brief descriptions of the word and in texts (such as 1 Pet. 1^{23}, Heb. 1^3 4^{12}, Eph. 5^{26} 6^{17}) which set forth its power.

Religion, according to the New Covenant, was to be inward, rooted in the heart, planted in the soul, a thing of the spirit and of the hidden springs of speech and conduct. But along with this depth there was to be a new breadth. It was to extend through all classes of the community, descending from the privileged and the favoured to the poorest and least fortunate. Not ruling families and prosperous circles, not the long-descended and the highly educated only, but all from the least unto

the greatest were to be sharers of the knowledge and grace of Jehovah. And accordingly, in the acceptable year of the Lord, the eyes of the blind were to be opened and the imprisoned spirits set at large. The spirit of light and healing would go forth, and the land would be filled with a people in whose enlightened worship and righteous service God would be glorified. But further, this new breadth would extend beyond the confines of the holy land and beyond the nations of which they had living experience. Isaiah had prophesied that from Jerusalem the law would go forth, and unto it homage would be rendered by all the world. Amos had spoken and is quoted (Acts $15^{16.\ 17}$) to a like effect. Now Deutero-Isaiah realises that Israel is the servant of Jehovah divinely commissioned for the accomplishment of this end. It is a little thing to restore the preserved of Israel, "I will also give Thee for a light to the Gentiles that thou mayest be My salvation unto the end of the earth" (Isa. 49^{6}). In this fundamental text of the apostolic missionary is revealed a conception of duty out of which sprang Christian universalism. Isolated sayings of Jesus pointed in this direction. In His words we find truth unshackled by prince or priest, unlimited in depth or breadth. But in the next generation His disciples lived in the face of the problems of tribe and nationality and class. At many points men pressed upon them as if to take the Kingdom by force. The power of Jesus was felt in the new and Holy Spirit which was moving teacher and taught to the creation of a new fellow-

ship. Then it was that those texts which spoke of the illumination of the Gentiles, or which set forth religion in terms transcending nationality and race, began to live on the lips of men; until at last the apostles who had lingered in Jerusalem felt prompted and encouraged to seek spheres of labour amongst the nations around. The voice of the risen Christ, heard across the fervid years in which the Church was planted in Jerusalem, seemed now to ring in their ears with one main note, "Go ye into all the world."

Paul is pre-eminently the Apostle of the Gentiles. He first and most clearly and best realised that this was the meaning of Christianity. At his conversion it was borne in on him that he was to bear the name of Christ before the Gentiles (Acts 9^{15} 22^{21} 26^{17}), and he, probably more than any other, was the pioneer preacher of universalism. If his vocation was primarily an inward call (Gal. 1^{16}), his mind was speedily enlarged and refreshed by a study of the O.T. texts which set forth the admission of the Gentiles as the purpose of God. The grand conception of a new community in which there was neither Jew nor Gentile, cultured nor barbarian, bond nor free, but instead, the higher distinction of a new holiness and a new life filled his mind; and to all classes he knew himself debtor. Two lines of philosophic defence of the new activity took shape: the historical, which went back to the promise to Abraham, which recognised the epoch of the Jew and the law as ended, and saw in the immediate future "the times of the Gentiles,"

though beyond these it discerned a fuller and richer realisation ; and the philosophical (as in Acts 17, Eph.), which based itself on the unity of the race, the solidarity of mankind, and the arrival of the time for the fulfilment of the eternal purpose to gather together in One all things in Christ. Here as elsewhere Christianity allied itself with the reason and conscience and common-sense of men. Yet both in his appeal to the Jews and in his turning from them, Paul justified himself by the messages of prophecy (Acts 13^{47} 28^{25}). His point of view was not the philosophic, but the ethical and historical. The starting-point was Abraham, and in the fulness of the times Christ came of the seed of David. The Jews, as in the past they had suffered and been scattered for their sins, so now for their unbelief were again rejected. Yet the Gentiles, whose day had come, were but as a branch grafted in ; and the original stock remained. Through the ages God's purposes advanced, and in the end Israel would be saved.

Once more the spirituality of religion portrayed in the epoch of the Exile showed its inwardness in a deeper feeling of individuality than we meet with before. Historically, religion was primarily national or tribal, and the duties of the individual were such as corresponded with the requirements of the tribe or nation. External marks and rites and a uniformity of practice were therefore reckoned essential. The perfect religion is freed from externalism and from the sanctities of time and place and circumstance. In Israel religion

descends from the nation to the individual, at last enabling each to realise the benefits of the community in which he is reared. But Christianity begins with the individual, and ultimately, from the union of men holding a common faith, arises a renovated community, a fellowship of saints. Here we see in the epoch of the Exile the culmination of the former and the anticipation of the latter. "I will put My spirit within you"; that is to say, for the language is real, in those of you who accept it, and with enlightened mind and conscience respond to the offer and law of God. "Create in me a clean heart" says the responsive worshipper, and "renew a right spirit within me." This note is found in many of the Psalms, which consequently have mirrored the experiences and expressed the aspirations of Christians in every age. The ideas of redemption and of forgiveness are frequent, and Paul finds "in David" something very like the bliss of the justified. Again, the descriptions of God as the refuge and strength of the soul, as the light and the health of the countenance, prepare for the Christian conception of the Divine Fatherhood and the Christian consciousness of adoption. In the Psalms is that consciousness of the personal relationship of the soul to God out of which Christianity arose; and in them not a little of that mysticism which is a characteristic mark of Paul, and on which his mind must have been fed. There is also the element of contrition, due to a deeper consciousness of personal sin and individual responsibility, due also to the realisation of the

nearness of the soul to God and the possibilities of a richer life through fellowship with Him. "I dwell in the high and holy place with him also that is of a contrite and a humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble and to revive the heart of the contrites." Who can doubt that on such texts Paul comforted and revived his spirit, finding thereby further assurance of the indwelling Spirit of God, and deriving strength to live his life of mingled penitence and power? Those sentences that marked the heights to which in moments of illumination seers and psalmists were able to rise became the normal elevation of the teachers of the apostolic age. But the apostles were able to maintain that elevation because they were the heirs of the ages, and daily fed their souls with what they deemed the word of life.

Individuality may be said to have been born from the broken shell of nationality, when the devout and enlightened worshipper appropriated to himself those pictures of prosperity and promises of bliss which the prophet saw awaiting the people. But to a nation belongs the element of permanence, and the Messianic kingdom was a kingdom of the ages. More and more the question asserted itself: Are these eternal promises for me? "Thou wilt show me the path of life; in thy presence is fulness of joy, at thy right hand are pleasures for evermore." This question of personal immortality occupies a place disproportionately small in the canonical literature of the O.T. Yet there is the clear beginning of the Christian hope. A doctrine of

redemption from death takes shape (Job 19^{25}, Ps. 49^{15}). And occasionally a clear full faith is uttered (Ps. $16^{10.\ 11}$ 73^{24-26} 17^{15} 49^{15}). It is a faith of the few and for the few, afterwards reinforced by doctrines of a Resurrection which from another point of view were preparatory to the Christian faith. What we suppose is that from the Exile can be traced the germ; those conceptions of life and righteousness and bliss which are independent of the accidents of time and breathe the spirit and potency of life everlasting. From these in union with the knowledge of the living and eternal God came the conviction that man also is immortal.

The above summary is not given with any purpose of exhaustiveness. And if it is in the epoch of the Exile that we first find full expression of fundamental Christian ideas, we do not forget that in Isaiah and other early prophets there are statements of absolute religion. There is much also in Deuteronomy and in the Book of Psalms which, without determining the date thereof, we may place at once on the Christian level. Our purpose has been to show that critics who are looking around, whether to Persia or to Greece or to any Asian region, for the distinctive ideas of Christianity, are looking away from the source of light. Contemporary outside influences had doubtless some slight trivial effect; an effect on literary men rather than on the body of the disciples, and on language rather than on thought. We may rest assured that to the original apostles the thought of the Gentile world was vanity and nothingness;

and that their minds were nourished primarily on Christ and secondarily on the prophets, or by the Holy Spirit, who for them illuminated the prophets and Christ.

Of ideas that grew up in the generations immediately preceding Christ, and had become an essential part of the thought of the religious population—inhaled from the atmosphere they lived in rather than derived from sacred Scripture—perhaps the most notable were the Messianic and the eschatological. Something of Messianic expectation had existed for well-nigh a thousand years, but in the last century or two it assumed more definite shapes. The conceptions varied greatly; some supposing that a man from heaven would descend from the clouds, others that a Jewish mother would be privileged to give birth to a Deliverer. The problem raised by the life of Christ was not whether a Messiah was to come, but whether He, the lowly Nazarene, was the genuine Son of God. But this problem, like all others, was complicated by the prejudices of parties, the privileges of vested interests, and the ambitions of individuals.

The eschatological ideas, whether of individual resurrection or of national regeneration, are also to be regarded as having grown unconsciously during a long period of time. They may have been slowly modified by contact with other peoples. A thousand influences may have tended to give them shape. But they were not transported from another land, and least of all from an Aryan people.

Resurrection is essentially Semitic. But in no country has there ever been complete agreement on such subjects. And to those proud Jews who mocked the possibility of resurrection, as the Cross of Christ was a stumbling-block so the Resurrection of Jesus was an absurdity. On the other hand, there were many to whom the fact of His Resurrection readily and completely proved the truth of Christianity. This question, then, is of fundamental importance, not only in its major aspect as a fact of history on which so much for us depends, but also in relation to the divisions of the apostolic age and the ethical ideas and spiritual hopes by which the first Christians were inspired. More shadowy were the doctrines of the regeneration or the restitution of all things, which bore some relation to Aryan theories of cycles of existence. For the study of the Gospels the most important question is the elucidation of the phrase "the Kingdom of God." Similarly, in the Epistles we are confronted by the "day of the Lord." The beautiful vision in the exordium of Acts (1^{11}) shows how the first Christians cherished a "blessed hope"; but this picture has to be studied as traced on a background of dim expectation and conflicting conception. In every age of ardent religion the outlook of the faithful must extend beyond the world of time. And in that age of intense devotion the dearest desire was the return of the Lord. And again, that return must mean redress, restitution, reform: a renovation of society, a Kingdom of God, a heaven and earth wherein

dwelleth righteousness. To trace the rise of such ideas must be the endeavour of specialists. In those days conceptions affecting personal condition or expectation did pass from tribe to tribe perhaps more readily than now. Above the fixed distinctions of race were floating clouds of common dreamland. And the hopes that followed the Resurrection of Jesus drew sustenance from these, and sometimes formed themselves into fantastic shapes.

Of the Epistles which interest us only two (1 and 2 Thess.) deal in the language of apocalypse. According to our view, they indicate a temporary phase in the work of their author or the history of the apostolic church. Their ideas and expression are derived mainly from that Literature of apocalyptic prophecy which begins with Daniel and extends to second Esdras and Baruch. This Literature, which dates from about 165 B.C. (reign of Antiochus Epiphanes), and extends into the Christian era, is prophetic in form and occupied with the study of the rise of empires and the task of forecasting history. Its lessons are presented in pictures or visions of which the imagery is to us sometimes obscure. But these books are also strong both in religious imagination and in ethical instruction. From this well the writer of 2 Thess. 1, 2, himself a prophet, an apocalyptist, and a religious and moral teacher, drank deep. Hence the day of wrath and the man of sin and all the mysterious machinery of judgment. But that this writer was Paul—let whoever pleases believe.

Along with these general ideas it is necessary to

understand something of the distinctions of parties that at this time prevailed among the Jewish people; something also of parties throughout the Græco-Roman world, and of any relationships existing between Jew and Greek. Even the most original author is in some degree influenced by the school in which he is educated or the society in which he is reared. Paul was a Pharisee. Luke was a Gentile (though perhaps reared as a proselyte). In the Epistle to the Hebrews there are traces of Alexandrian philosophy. Thus the writings of the N.T. come from men of most various types.

The most Jewish of the Jews were the Pharisees, from whom came the scribes, who were the recognised expounders and interpreters of the law, and to whom every little point of religious observance and every requirement of ceremonial purity were supremely important. They were the patriotic party, longing for the time when every trace of foreign domination would be wiped out. They were the religious party, eager to guard every custom and tradition of their race. They were an ambitious party, resolved to have in their own hands the main direction of the life of their people. Paul had been reared a strict Pharisee: ignorant of secular culture, antagonistic to the ideas of other lands. Though he was born in a distant province, his mother had preserved the religious spirit of the fatherland. She instilled into him a love of the faith of Israel, and guarded him from the ideas of philosophy or the influences of paganism. In due

time he was sent to the mother city to be reared at the central shrine of the ancient faith and trained in rabbinical lore. It was therefore natural that he should recognise in Stephen a mortal enemy of the system he had espoused. And it is an extreme instance of the working of antinomies that this champion of traditionalism, the rising hope of the legalists, should have become the apostle of spirituality, and the champion of freedom. But great as the change was, it does not mean that the early education passed away. Paul's categories are still rabbinical: the law with its requirements and its authority; the problem of justification; the necessity of expiation or redemption and the hope of life. And again, the resurrection and the certainty of judgment; for Paul was of those who held the double resurrection and the formal condemnation of the wicked. Even in regard to the doctrine on which all turned—the Messiahship—Paul to the end regarded the Davidic descent (a doctrine of the Pharisees) as of supreme importance (Rom. 1^{3}), and seems to have given to his companion a dying injunction to hold aloft this important fact (2 Tim. 2^{8}, Luke 2^{4}, Acts 2^{30} 13^{23}). Of this party, or of the men it reared, Paul is perhaps the only one who took part in the founding of Christianity. Nevertheless we have to recognise that through him their forms have entered into the framework of our Protestant theology.

Opposed to the Pharisees were the Sadducees, a more aristocratic and less zealous body, who for a century or two had been imbibing elements of

Greek thought and civilisation; and who therefore only partially believed the religion of their country. They were a semi-rationalistic section, concerned more with the advantages than with the truth of religion. There is no evidence that any one of Sadducean antecedents contributed to the N.T., or indeed any member of any other Jewish sect.

But other Jewish influences there were. There was the home priesthood, a hereditary body of which the members might belong to any of the sects, but of whom some were constantly employed in the service, λατρεία, of religion. They presided over the temple ritual and the offering of sacrifices, and they made atonement for the people. Whatever pertained to worship or sacrifice was under their control; but in the majority of cases it is the priesthood that rears the men who keep alive the ideas of religion. A "great company of the priests" became Christians. For, as Malachi has said, the priest is the messenger of Jehovah, it is his duty to conserve knowledge, and men should seek instructions from his lips. It is one of the contentions of this volume that a large part of the Epistles is from the pen of a man whose mind is steeped in the ideas of the priesthood. Yet here again we are in the region of antinomy. As Paul rejected the form and the letter in order to preserve the spirit, so this writer insists on the cessation of sacrifices that the final sacrifice may be fully efficacious, commanding the people to present not dead but living sacrifices, namely, those of the lips of praise and of the life of service.

Another influence to be mentioned is the Græco-Jewish or Alexandrian. It is supposed that this influence is to be found in the Johannine writings and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and perhaps in Colossians, and slightly elsewhere. It is found in such points as the doctrine of the Logos, the descriptions of Christ as the image or effulgence of God, and in conceptions of Christianity as the truth or the absolute religion. But it would be a mistake to suppose that the phraseology or the mode of thought of such a writer as Philo originated with him. Alexandria was a seat of culture, both classical and Hebraic, long before the Christian era; and it is probable that attempts to blend the two in a religious philosophy are of earlier date than the first century. It follows that this religio-philosophic terminology had ample time to diffuse itself through other centres of learning. Again, the prominence of Apollos in the Pauline band of preachers, and the powerful impression which he so easily made, indicate a way by which Alexandrian ideas could find entrance into the minds of Paul's followers. The writings that here concern us are certainly not those of Paul himself (first group), or those of Luke (the Pastorals), but Hebrews, Ephesians, Colossians. And the influence is not technical, but consists simply in a wider imaginativeness and a more philosophic cast of expression. We are thus bound to suppose that the writers of these letters did in their later years come in contact with this movement, and that they imbibed something of its spirit,—not, however, becoming captive thereto, but

rather making it captive for the service of Christ. Nor is there any difficulty in supposing that, after the tragic events in Rome, Alexandria became for some years an abode of evangelists and a place where Christians and Philonists freely exchanged opinions. There is, we think, no trace of Alexandrianism in 1 Peter, though in Ephesians, a fuller duplicate of that Epistle, it is definite enough; whence we may infer that in the interval between the two the author made himself familiar with this mode of thought. In Colossians, there is nothing that may not be derived from Ephesians and Hebrews.

It is notable that these two influences—the priestly basis and the philosophic acquirement—belong to the same author; a fact which reminds us that Philo himself was of priestly family. But again, this versatile author shows himself familiar with non-canonical Jewish literature in the two departments of the books of Wisdom and the Apocalyptic writings. To the latter we have already referred. Of the former the main works are "Sirach" and the "Wisdom of Solomon." Both represent the influence of Greek culture on the Hebrew mind. The former is allied to the Sadduceeism of its time, and the latter is a sort of precursor of the Alexandrianism of apostolic generation. The points of community between our second group and these two books are numerous. (So also of the Pastorals.) It appears chiefly in repetition or similarity of phrase. But perhaps the Platonic and Stoic tendencies of the later Pauline Epistles are due not so much to the classic originals

as to the Book of Wisdom, in which they are already clearly marked. In addition, we may in some measure trace to this book the frequency of terms of knowledge or ignorance or understanding or revelation so frequently used of the Christian life, the grouping of maxims (as in Rom. 12), and many individual touches, such as the Christian armour (Eph. 6).

But these apocryphal books are of secondary importance. They represent the recent literature by which educated men would refresh and enrich their minds. Intellectual activity abounded. Judaism in contact with the Greek and Roman worlds could not but be moved, at least on its surface. The forces of conservatism and liberalism, of traditionalism and expansiveness, could not but assert themselves. And it was natural that the Hellenistic Jew who knew the writings, and in some cases received the education, of the Greeks, should desire to carry over to his own people the best, as it would seem to him, of what was said and thought by the brilliantly gifted people whom he met abroad. It was natural also that these broader treatises should commend themselves to the liberalised Jews who had passed into the Christian Church. And, in particular, men that were ministering amongst the Greek-speaking peoples of the empire would find such books profitable for their own instruction and equipment. But their fundamental thoughts came not from these, but from the Holy Scriptures of long ago, the Law, and the master-prophets of their land.

The Christians of Jerusalem showed from a very early period a tendency to divide into two parties known as the Hebraic and Hellenistic. The former, or Palestinian type, is perhaps represented by the Epistle of James. The latter first rose into distinction in the brief career of Stephen; compelled acknowledgment from apostolic leaders; and finally insisted on acceptance of the mission to the Gentiles. To it and its aggressive energies or results belong most of the Epistles. And it is probable that Silas—who was chosen by the Council of Jerusalem to be a spokesman at Antioch, and who thereafter was invited by Paul to be his colleague—was its typical representative. These were the men who in co-operation with the Apostle of the Gentiles delivered Christianity from Jewish or Palestinian Ebionitism, gave it its comprehensive and spiritual character, preserved the prophetic spirit in the forms of Gentile culture, and secured the reconciliation of the conflicting elements of race.

The writers of the N. T. include one at least who was educated amongst the Greeks, and who carried over into Christianity terms of the Greek religionists, terms that are found from Hesiod and Homer down to the philosophic historic and Eleusinian mysteries of his day. But Luke was in no sense a dogmatist. His ideas were moral, political, social, general. And if, therefore, such a term as *ἀντίλυτρον* or *μεσίτης* was introduced by him into the Christian Scriptures, it was certainly with no intention on his part of fixing a theological conception. Luke helped to enlarge the Christian

ethics and to broaden the expression of Christianity in adaptation to the requirements of the educated mind of the empire. His chief literary guide was perhaps Polybius; but he presents points of contact with contemporaries (Plutarch, Josephus), and indeed with all the historical and political writers of the past. But such an author presents no problems in connection with the development of religious thought. He serves, however, to remind us that there was an intellectual and a spiritual element in the Græco-Roman world, and that a full understanding of the planting of Christianity requires a full knowledge of the various modes of thought and forces of reform that prevailed throughout the Roman world.

That condition of the empire, together with the long history of thought, of onward progress and spiritual emancipation, gave rise to the expression, "the fulness of the time" (Gal. 4^4, Eph. 1^{10}). Whether this phrase and the meanings it expressed, and the conceptions that gathered round it, are to be attributed to Paul, or to Luke, or to others, it strikingly embodies a great thought. It presents a providential and evolutionary view of history. It traces Divine purpose (*πρόθεσις*) through the ages, and sees in the world's government a Divine dispensation (*οἰκονομία*). We may, like Paul, regard it from the point of view of the education of the race, and recognise the era when mind was emancipated from the domination of custom and form, and when nations were able to receive a spiritual and universal religion. Or we may consider the

situation of the time, when a widely extended empire and a widely diffused civilisation and a community of law and speech enabled the word to "run," and the preacher to conceive of a vast organisation of believers that would embrace the elect of every land. Or we may think of secret longings that sprang up in the bosom of decadence for purer lives and more brotherly sentiments, and some new spiritual power to rescue mankind from the debasing idolatries, shameless corruptions, and moral paralysis that marked alike the highest and the lowest in a world whose vast possibilities of greatness they were now able dimly to realise. It has always been recognised that in Greece there was a providential preparation for Christ. In the moral ideals of Platonists and Stoics was to be found material out of which the living seed could draw sustenance for a new and living growth. And in one respect common ideas and intercommunication had taken shape in a form that proved largely helpful to the diffusion of Christianity. This was the system of proselytism encouraged or allowed in connection with the synagogues abroad. Silently a system had grown up by which Moses had in every city his non-Semitic worshippers (Acts 15^{21}). And this proved the thin end of a wedge, or a basis of advance from which retrogression was impossible and a forward movement inevitable.

One other point belongs to this body of preliminary observations, namely, the conversion of Paul. Here we do not mean the historic fact, or

the evidence it affords of the supernatural, or its providential character in creating an Apostle of the Gentiles, but the influence due to the vision of Christ in the determining of the form of the Pauline theology. If the original Pharisaism shines through the ultimate doctrines, no less clearly does the knowledge of the risen Lord impress a definite character on the doctrines of salvation; and not on the doctrines only, but on the entire conception of the new life of the believer. The importance of the event is marked by the threefold account that Luke has given us; and other three times does Paul himself in his Epistles refer to it. He was a man, indeed, of visions. One vision sent him from Jerusalem to the region of the Gentiles; another from Troas into Europe; a third encouraged him to remain in Corinth; a fourth gave him glimpses of Paradise; a fifth sustained him in shipwreck, and many more are untold. But the vision on the way to Damascus is placed apart from these. Paul himself brackets it with the appearances immediately after the Resurrection (1 Cor. 15^{8}), describes it as a revelation of the Son of God (Gal. 1^{16}), and paints the subsequent mental illumination as comparable to morning sunrise over a world that was in darkness (2 Cor. 4^{6}). To his eyes, therefore, was presented not a mere luminous manifestation, not a flash of preternatural brightness, but a distinct form with whom he held speech, a heavenly figure whom he worshipped as Lord. But the full meaning of the fact could not at once be realised. Paul retired

into Arabia, re-studied the Scriptures, re-interpreted history and the ways of God and purposes of grace. But he also recognised himself not only as one who had seen Christ, but as one who thereby was called to be an apostle of Christ. And not only so, but, knowing Christ as a living Person, he made it his aim to know Him more and more in a life of personal communion. The subjective side of his religion he named faith, the faith of Christ. And he lived in constant prayer and spiritual effort, striving to apprehend. On the other hand, by visions that guided his course, and by inward experiences of joy and strength and upward attainment, he was sure that Christ was keeping him and strengthening him for every trial. The source of power was objective. Now it is assuredly the case that the Resurrection of Christ is the central doctrine or fact of Paulinism, throwing its light backward on the Cross, forward on the life to be. The risen Christ is the Lord, the Spirit, whose indwelling power transforms the soul and life. And this risen Christ is the heavenly Man in whom is to be found the pattern of an immortal existence. The Resurrection is thus the confirmation of doctrine and the basis of hope. And it is more. It presents that antitype of heavenly manhood, that image of heavenly glory into the likeness of which the faithful when they rise to their second birthright as "sons of God" are predestined to be transformed.

CHAPTER III

THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS

THE Epistles of the New Testament take their beginning from correspondence between Paul and the Church of Corinth conducted when, a year or two after his leaving Greece, he was labouring in his next great centre, Ephesus. Paul had already been a Christian for twenty years; he had laboured long amongst his countrymen, and had experienced much conflict of which no detailed record remains (2 Cor. $2^{23.\ 27}$). In the course of his career he was brought to Antioch, where Christianity first asserted its aggressive and expansive character. From Antioch he made, with Barnabas, the tour through Cyprus and Southern Galatia which is known as the First Missionary Journey. In the company of these leaders was a Gentile youth, one of the "Greeks" or Græco-Syrians by whom the Gospel had been received, who from his notes has bequeathed to us a narrative of this epoch-making expedition. A year or two later, and when principles had been agreed on at a Council in Jerusalem, Paul again set out on the life-work to which he knew that he had been called. On this occasion the former partnership was dis-

solved, and he now chose as his chief companion a leading Christian from Jerusalem who represented the more liberal element in the mother-city, and who combined prophetic powers and Hellenistic sympathies. Paul groped his way through inhospitable regions till he found himself on the west coast of Asia Minor, on classic soil, where stood the town of Troas. From that date Paul's life emerges into clearness. His whole course is traced, and his movements, sometimes summarily or vaguely and sometimes minutely, are recorded even as far as the imperial city and the precincts of the prætorium, where suddenly the curtain falls. From Troas, under Divine guidance, the apostle sailed into Europe. In Macedonia the Churches of Philippi and Thessalonica, with others of smaller note, sprang into existence. Philippi continued to be his best-beloved foundation. But under stress of opposition he moved quickly onward, following the instinct that prompted him to seek the intellectual capital. But Athens was a deep disappointment. Superstition and frivolity mingled with the echoes of philosophy. Moral earnestness seemed non-existent. He was met with indifference or disdain. Depressed in health and spirits he proceeded to Corinth, the commercial metropolis. There, after weeks of anxious waiting, he was joined by his companions who brought from Macedonia messages and gifts of love. Then pressed in spirit he began his earnest testimony. Success amongst the Jews led to active opposition; and the narrative tells of an abortive prosecution before a

Roman governor who refused to allow questions between Jew and Christian to be made matters of criminal jurisdiction, and whose tolerance made him indifferent even to violence associated with religious animosity. Paul found disciples also among the proselytes, and, later, in the general Greek community. Corinth as a capital, a sea-port, a commercial centre and a chief station in the line of communication between East and West, had, like Antioch, a very mixed population, a very mixed religious and moral code. Yet in such cities were to be found many who, on the one hand, were less fettered by bigotry, and, on the other, were desirous of deliverance from the low atmosphere and poisonous influences amid which they were placed.

The new Church was drawn chiefly from the unrecognised classes. Men of rank, learning, and power stood, mainly, aloof. Yet there were in it many through whom the Divine Spirit unmistakably exhibited the manifold gifts of grace. In the rude but eager audiences that thronged to hear the preacher Paul discerned the raw material out of which might arise a living and sanctified Church. In his weakness and anxiety there came to him the Vision, with the Voice: "I have much people in this city"; and, strengthened thereby, he prolonged his residence and his labours. He had but one message and one theme—Jesus Christ and Him crucified. This included the Atonement and the Resurrection, which meant the wisdom and the power of God. He saw himself as a master-builder who on a sure foundation begins a structure, or as

a husbandman who plants what God will cause to grow. And the "word" took root, and grew, and prospered. At Corinth he beheld a Church of God sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints (1 Cor. 1[1]).

Eighteen months he remained in Corinth, but other capitals and other conquests were in his mind. Arrangements he doubtless made for the continuance of the work he had begun. It was perhaps imperative, in the first instance (though the words to that effect are now omitted), that he should attend a coming feast, Pentecost, in Jerusalem, so as to keep in touch with apostolic headquarters, reporting, learning, harmonising, planning for the future. Accordingly, without being able, as was his wont, to revisit former scenes of labour in Macedonia or Galatia, he set sail from Cenchrea, halting with his vessel at Miletus, glancing hurriedly at Ephesus, and then proceeding to the Jewish capital. At Jerusalem he attended the feast, saluting the Church; and then he hastened away to Antioch. He may have felt the stillness of a coming storm, or heard the mutterings of distant thunder; but the only thing ascertainable is a new attention to the matter of collections for the poor of the parent community. (Critics dispute which of the former visits to Jerusalem corresponds to Gal. 2[1. 10]; but it may be noted that some points, namely, the collection, the presence of Titus, the reports of emissaries, and the guidance by revelation, accord best with this later occasion.) In Antioch, which was his truer metropolis, he would have

found more congenial society and more refreshing repose. Thence, for the third time, in due season he departed. Rome was already on his horizon, and perhaps regions beyond Rome. But for the present these dreams must be foregone. The tribute offering of Galatia and Greece must be gathered, and the standard of the Cross must be planted in that Asiatic capital where stood in the place of honour the shrines and temples of Diana. Accordingly, leaving Antioch, and on his way revisiting his churches in the country of Galatia-Phrygia, he arrived by way of the "upper region" at Ephesus. There for three months he argued with the Jews in their synagogue; but when, at last, persuasion was answered with angry passion he withdrew from work amongst them, and took the bold step of forming the body of Christians whom he found there, and doubtless increased into a new and distinct community. For two years he remained amongst them, conducting, except when on tour, daily services in a schoolroom rented for the purpose (Acts $19^{9, 10}$). During these two years the epistolary literature began.

It may be presumed that at no time did Paul forget his children in the Lord. Amongst the many burdens mentioned in 2 Corinthians is the "care of all the Churches." With the Corinthians he had lived longer than in any other of his stations until now; consequently they were no small part of that load of anxious concern. Between Corinth and Ephesus communication was direct and easy; and perhaps no month of the long stay at Ephesus

passed in which he did not receive or despatch some message. But such messages would usually be semi-private. The canonical Epistles are addressed to the Church as a whole. And of these the Second was written after the author had left Ephesus.

It is usual to set forth the evidence for the authorship and authenticity of books under review. But the Pauline Epistles are self-evidencing, and laborious attestation is unnecessary. Enough of the First Epistle to say that it is repeatedly quoted in the earliest sub-apostolic document,—the Epistle of Clement of Rome, written (as is supposed) in the nineties to the same Corinthian Church. This gives it the highest external attestation possessed by N.T. writings. But it is disappointing and curious that to this same Clement (who also quotes largely from the second group) the existence of the Second Epistle seems to have been unknown. This can only mean that it was of later publication and diffusion. No sane and serious man would attempt to separate the two. In style and doctrine they are the same, nor can we distinguish them (as some do) in tone; they are in many points interdependent, though the occasions are different; and they both in an eminent degree convey full and living images of their writer's mind. The task of critical exposition is to construct the historical situations which in some points are only obscurely indicated, and to analyse and interpret the instruction.

As to dates, the Second Epistle presents least

difficulty. It was written from Macedonia (probably Philippi) on the arrival from Corinth of Titus with encouraging intelligence (2 Cor. 7^{7}). It lies between Paul's departure from Ephesus and the tour in Greece that preceded the fateful journey to Jerusalem. Paul's intention had been to leave Ephesus on the conclusion of the feast of Pentecost (1 Cor. 16^{8}). The riot may have altered the exact time, though not to any great extent. The autumn of the year was spent in the regions of Macedonia, and in expeditions round even to Illyricum. Then after three months of wintering in Greece Paul and his companions turned homeward, returning, by a sudden change of plan, through Macedonia, celebrating the Paschal week in the city where first as last they had preached in Europe, and then bidding farewell. The Second Epistle was written before this detour to Illyricum some time in the early autumn, the year being 56 A.D., or one more or less. One problem of the Epistle is to know what was the new trouble that grieved the apostle and for a time produced strained relations (7^{8-12}). Another question concerns the unity of the Epistle, it being deemed probable that the last four chapters were originally a separate letter.

The First Epistle may naturally be referred to the autumn or early winter of the preceding year. That it was written about a year before the Second may be inferred from 2 Cor. 8^{10} 9^{2}, taken in connection with the instruction in 1 Cor. 16^{1}. But his plans for leaving Ephesus were already made (1 Cor. 16^{8}); and a longer period is therefore un-

likely. He had thus been perhaps two years in correspondence, and the letter must be regarded as a summing up rather than a first expression of the apostle's judgment on questions of discipline and controversy. In one case (5^{9}) reference is made to an instruction formerly sent which is now repeated and explained. That there were other letters is indicated in 2 Cor. 10^{10}. Some passages (2 Cor. 12^{14} 13^{1}, cf. 2^{1}) seem to indicate an unknown visit. There was also the plan of going direct from Ephesus to Corinth and thence to Macedonia, which it would appear was departed from on account of the unpleasant situation that had arisen (2 Cor. 1^{23} $2^{3.4}$ 7^{9-11}). In this new trouble the apostle's own authority seems to have been involved. But whether it had to do with Timothy (1 Cor. 16^{10}) or is an entirely unknown matter is a question unsolved. Paul had been looking forward to a happy visit, with a season of fresh exertion and joyful communion (2 Cor. $1^{15.16}$); but in the circumstances this prospect was clouded, and he sent instead messengers and a letter of remonstrance or reproof. The theory that this indignant letter is preserved in 2 Cor. 10–13 is now in favour; and this view seems probable if we may suppose that the most personal and pointed part is omitted, and only the concluding portion preserved. What we have in these last four chapters is by no means a passionate outburst of pure indignation. The autobiography and the playfulness are alike opposed to such a view. Yet the vein is certainly different from what we find in chaps. 1–7, while the intro-

duction of the collection in 8 seems to mark the proper close. The last chapters remind us of the swell of waters after a storm has burst and the gale is spent. We may therefore suppose that a skilful editor has preserved the permanently useful part by appending it as the peroration of another.

The bearer of this sharp letter was Titus, who according to arrangement is, after a satisfactory settlement in Corinth, to meet Paul in Macedonia, whither also Timothy and Erastus have been sent in advance (Acts 19^{22}) to make arrangements for the coming and campaign of the apostle. After a time of anxious suspense Titus arrived with a gratifying report; and Paul, now encouraged and comforted, wrote the Second Epistle (2 Cor. 1–8 or 1–9). This also is borne by Titus; now accompanied by another brother whose fame in the Gospel is in all the churches (probably, as tradition supposed, Luke); and with him still another, possibly Erastus, or Tychicus, or Trophimus, or Gaius, or some worthy Christian unknown.

The contents of 1 Corinthians are one long setting forth of its occasions. The apostle gives authoritative direction with regard either to evils reported to him or difficulties referred to. There are thus two divisions, 1–6 and 7–16; but the second may again be divided into two, 7–11, 12–15. In the first (1–6) the apostle deals with two evils, faction or sectarianism, which is rampant, and moral failure, either in special wrong-doing or in general quarrelsomeness. Then follow religious or social problems (7–11). These include marriage (7), contact with

idolatry and the limits of freedom (8–10), and church services, including the celebration of the Supper (11). Thereafter he turns his thoughts first to the exercise of spiritual gifts (12–14), and finally to the theme of the Resurrection (15),—subjects which he handles with great insight and power. The manner in this Epistle is not that of the systematic theologian who relates his whole subject to one central and commanding idea, but of the masterly teacher who brings forward his successive themes separately, naturally, lucidly, fully, and throws upon them the light of a large comprehensive mind and of high ethical ideas. And in occasional illuminating reflection half the value lies. The first section (1^{10}–4) is in this respect one of the richest. This question of factions, and again the rivalry of gifts and powers, have laid hold of his imagination as imminent dangers to the unity, and therefore to the prosperity and power, of the Church. And, accordingly, on these incipient evils he turns the searchlight of deeper regions of truth. There are (he hears) four parties forming in Corinth: calling themselves after Paul and Peter and Apollos and Messiah. In opposition to this exaltation of men he exalts Christ as the Master or Lord whose ministers and stewards they all are. Christ alone is Lord, and there is no other foundation. The varying gifts of men are as nothing when seen in their true relations. God alone gave the life and the increase. He giveth also the preachers, gifts; and these gifts, like the world itself, are for the good of all God's people. The possessors of them are

responsible for the use of talents and opportunities; and a day of testing will come when not man's judgments, but God's, will be revealed.

It is clear, however, that many of the Corinthians were charmed by the external qualities of Apollos, by his eloquence and learning; perhaps by his mastery of the Greek teaching of rhetoric and philosophy, perhaps by a freedom of theosophic speculation that pleased or fascinated. Most of the Corinthian Christians were Greeks; and even those who had been Jews or proselytes would in many cases have had a training quite unlike Paul's at Jerusalem. There is, therefore, nothing surprising in the formation of an Apollos party. But Paul saw therein a departure from the truth of the Gospel and the simplicity that is in Christ. He was ready to admit inferiority in eloquence, but that was unimportant and irrelevant. The true source and inspiration of faith is not the wisdom of man but the power of God. But again, what is wisdom? The Greeks have studied philosophy for centuries, and with what result?—with ignorance of God, with multitudes of idols, with demonolatry and immorality. And in this great crisis and renewal of the world what part was philosophy playing? Where is the wise, the scribe, the disputant? Paul had studied the matter at Athens, and his conclusion was that God had made foolish man's philosophy. That is the one side which he puts forth not in depreciation of Apollos (cf. 16^{12}), but in warning to his children who by ardent fancy might be captivated or beguiled. But on the other hand, as

there was a wisdom of discourse pertaining to man and this age, so also there was a hidden wisdom belonging to God ordained before the ages (1^{17} 2^{7}). It was this better and more glorious wisdom that was now revealed, understood by the "spiritual" and preached by them to those who were "perfect" or able to receive it.

In this section there are two main themes of doctrine: the all-sufficiency of Christ and the revealing or enlightening work of the Spirit. Christ has the value of God. "All things are yours, and ye are Christ's and Christ is God's." To be enlightened by the Spirit of God is to have the "mind of Christ." And for man's sake—for the called and for all that are found in Christ Jesus, He is the power and the wisdom of God—a power to save and to exalt, a wisdom that may be deemed righteousness, sanctification, redemption. It is manifest from the texts 1^{30} 6^{11} that Paul's mind is already familiar with the soteriology of the Epistle to the Romans. Again, the emphasis is on the Cross as central and fundamental. The theology thereof (expounded in Rom. 3^{25}) is here assumed as a thing with which they have been made familiar. He does not deem it necessary to explain in what sense Christ is Righteousness or Redemption. But he recalls the theme rather to show the folly of human wisdom and the vanity of human pride. And from it he can readily pass to that kindred fact, the choice of many that are poor and uneducated to surpass the mighty and the wise.

More subtle is his doctrine of the Spirit. The

Spirit of God is related to God as man's spirit or inner principle of intelligence is to man. And this Spirit communicates with the human spirit so that God reveals to us. Yet not to all men. The ordinary man is merely psychic, and only when he is touched by the Spirit of God does he become pneumatic or spiritual. To the psychic or natural man the things of God are incomprehensible. He is led by the shows of things, the pomp of speech or the pride of life. But the spiritual man has the gift of intuition, he can distinguish the apparent from the real, and by comparing spiritual things with spiritual can acquire knowledge of the mysteries of God.

"Mysteries" was a term of the time both of the Greeks with whom it originated and of the Jewish Apocrypha. It appears in the N.T. in the Synoptics, in Paul, in Ephesians, in the Pastorals, and perhaps with a different usage in each. In the Pastorals it denotes the incomprehensible; in Ephesians, the unanticipated universalism; in the Synoptics, the secret principles of the growth of the Kingdom; but in Paul, that mystic knowledge of Christ or of the doctrines of grace which were unfolded to his mind in the process of inward revelation. These mysteries are styled by his colleague "the manifold grace of God." They included everything of the Divine nature and will which the spiritual mind was unable to discern.

The second section of this first part censures a gross violation of natural law, and the apostle calls for the excommunication of the offender. "Let us keep festival not with the old leaven of

evil, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." In this connection he explains the former letter in which he had ordered not the cessation of communication with Gentiles on account of evil (for all of them were immoral, and thus they would be cutting themselves off from mankind), but dissociation from the lawless in their own community. And again, he condemns with equal emphasis lawsuits and litigation before Gentile judges; even suits in which some of them have tried to defraud their brethren. "The unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God." This is one of Paul's rare uses of that chief term of Christ; and he uses it not of this world but of the future inheritance. This section contains the assertion that the saints shall judge the world. (Much more should they be able to manage their own affairs.) The passage is closely allied in thought to Luke 22^{24-30}. Again, in abrupt brief sentences he glances at their controversies and wrong-doings; quarrels about food which are not matters of law but of expediency, and which must not dominate the spirit (6^{12}), questions also concerning not meats but the body which is more than meat. Here he gives us his two great thoughts of the body: it is a temple inhabited by the Spirit of God, and it will be made immortal. "God both raised the Lord, and will raise up us through His power"; "glorify God in your body." The earlier expression of the body as a temple $3^{16.\ 17}$ is in its content not very intelligible, and is perhaps an interpolation. It seems to accord rather with the conception characteristic of the

second group of the Church as a temple, and as a Body of which Christ is the Head.

Chapter 7 begins the second part, the answers to matters of perplexity referred to him. The first of these concerns marriage, with questions of celibacy, and of separation when there is difference of religion; then other matters of domestic custom and the question of acquiescence in slavery. How keen and searching are the words of Paul, and how pointed his utterance! how rapid and clear and masterful his thought! "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing; but the keeping of the commandments of God." He that was called in the Lord being a bond-servant is Christ's freedman; he that was called being free is Christ's bond-servant. And so He counsels moral freedom and social contentment. On the vexed questions of marriage in that age of uncertainty and transition, of domestic division and social conflict, Paul speaks tentatively, recognising the time as one of storm and stress in which the fashion of the world is passing away, careful not to disown Christian freedom, but recording his own preference for celibacy.

Chapter 8 begins a long section on questions of idolatrous pollution. Chief is the question, already discussed in the Council at Jerusalem, of the eating of things sacrificed to idols. Paul shows how complicated the matter is, and how necessary it is to comprehend general principles. One knows an idol to be a nonentity and its contamination to be (objectively) unreal; another of weak intelligence

has his conscience weakened and defiled. But again, there is the effect on others ; and the philosophic Christian who is seen sitting in the idol temple becomes the seducer of the humble brother who has been struggling to cleanse himself from contamination (8^{9-12}). What happened in the Old Dispensation ? The children of Israel were formed into a spiritual community, and partook of spiritual food. Yet they lusted after evil things—idolatry and sinful practices—and tempting God they brought destruction on themselves (10^{1-13}). The gravity of the case is illustrated by the Feast of Communion. The one bread constitutes the congregation as one body : and the bread and cup are a communion of the body and blood of Christ. Similarly the Gentiles by food and drink seek communion with demons. Shall the Christians partake both of the table of the Lord and of the table of demons ? A moral question is suggested of great intensity.

The subject is further illustrated by a copious reference (9) to the apostle's own life. Free to all life's comforts he has abandoned all, adapting himself to every humbling situation, for the gospel's sake and for the winning of the prize. "Be ye imitators of me, as I am of Christ." Again, in conclusion, and on the general aspects of the case, he reasserts the principle of expediency (8^{9} 10^{23}). Not lawfulness or personal rights, but the general good (10^{24}). Give no occasion of stumbling to Jews or Greeks or to the Church of God (8^{9} 10^{32}). The higher expediency is here an aspect of the law of love. And there is another

and still higher law: do all to the glory of God (10^{31}).

In the course of this argument Paul has a notable digression on his own apostleship and example (9); and again an appeal based on O.T. history and its warnings, wherein by a notable spiritualising exegesis he finds in Jehovah's guidance of His people the same blessings bestowed as are now revealed through Christ (10^{1-13}). For even then in the desert Christ was the leader and the giver of life.

Then follows a chapter (11^{2-34}) on their own modes of worship and religious observance. The first paragraph forbids the unveiling of women in their assemblies. This instruction is perhaps another illustration of temporary expediency. Then he refers to rumours that had reached him of riotous concourse. And in particular he proceeds to speak of the Lord's Supper. He condemns the use of it as an ordinary meal, and the want of simultaneity in commencement; and he recounts the form of institution. The words are the same as in Luke, who must have copied them from Paul, or from a source used by Paul. They are a modification of words and forms used by the Jews in the celebration of the Passover. They are from (*ἀπό*) the Lord; which means that they are Christ's words, but hardly that Paul received them directly from Christ (in which case he would have used *παρά*: Gal. 1^{12}, cf 1 Thess. 2^{13} 4^{1}, 2 Thess. 3^{6}). They describe the Lord's Supper as a memorial of His Death, and make

the celebration binding till the Second Coming. And as the breaking of the bread symbolises the death of the body crucified in His people's behalf, so the cup is the emblem of the New Covenant ratified and sealed by the blood poured forth. The rite is therefore specially solemn, setting forth, as it does, the redemptive Death of Christ and the founding of the New Covenant. It is to be celebrated gravely and worthily, with discernment of the truths and facts set forth.

Other matters connected with worship and religious service Paul will regulate when he reaches Corinth (11^{34}).

This chapter is important doctrinally in its description of the institution of the Supper. Paul here simply accepts the apostolic doctrine of Christ's atoning Death. The words of Christ are understood as establishing the New Covenant in supersession of the Old. And the reference to the Blood is understood to mean that thereby the Covenant is sealed; that is to say, that by Christ's Death the propitiation is completely effected. Sacrificial language is not natural to Paul; yet here and in Rom. 3^{25} it is made fundamental. Christ's Death is an atoning sacrifice. To Paul perhaps is due the epithet "new," not found in Matthew or Mark. Further, it is to be noted that in describing the service as a proclaiming, or showing forth, of Christ's Death, and as a matter involving judgment, there is no suggestion of a magical communication of virtue or grace.

With chap. 12 begins the third and greatest

of the three parts of the Epistle. It contains two great sections and the closing chapter. The first of these sections is a masterly exposition of *charisms* or spiritual gifts. At the outset Paul had thanked God that the Corinthians were enriched in Christ "in all utterance and all knowledge" (1^5). Whatever, therefore, we may think of the moral defects revealed in the first half of the Epistle we cannot deny that there was in the Corinthian Church life of a kind. The Christians were not imbeciles, but clever active men to whom Christianity came as a revelation from heaven. The very fact of faction, the attachment of some to Peter as the head of the apostolic college, the admiration of others for the eloquent Alexandrian, the loyalty of many to their original founder, and the aloofness of others from all these attitudes—shows the presence of intelligent and independent thought. But this activity was marred by the unloveliness of strife and by confusion of administration. And Paul now presents to them the whole subject of powers and spiritual endowment in the light of large principles of public duty.

In the first place, he refers all gifts to the Holy Spirit. But inasmuch as in the past they were under the influence of delusive oracles and utterance, at the outset he gives tests for the determination of what comes from God. Then he observes that in the government of things there are to be found the two principles of unity and variety. The forces of the world are various, but behind them all is the same God; the forms of ministra-

tion are many, but there is one Lord over all; the gifts of mental endowment are also diverse, but there is one Spirit operating through all. Now, in the ferment of intellectual and spiritual life in Corinth these gifts have been exhibited in manifold variety; not without envy and confusion. This is due to the failure to realise the unity and to recognise the kinship of all the various manifestations. Next, he leads them to the conception of organic interdependence. The Christians of a self-governing community constitute a body which may be compared to the human body with its many parts and members. On the right adjustment or due distribution of those members depends the health of the whole. According to this conception a strife of gifts, or of men variously gifted, is a war of members. The prosperity of the community, like the health of the body, depends on harmonious co-operation for common ends. Such is the general conception; but it has to be emphasised that these gifts show the activity of the Divine Spirit acting through a troubled human medium, and that the community of Christians is a body of Christ in which He fulfils His life.

Now, let us note what in Paul's view the most notable of these gifts were. He specifies nine: discourse of wisdom (*sophia*), discourse of knowledge (*gnosis*), faith, faculties of healing, workings of miracles, prophecy, discernings of spirits, kinds of tongues, the interpretation of tongues. They are in groups of three: the first triad indicating forms of intellectual or inward power; the second,

three forms of apparently miraculous activity; the third, more specialised forms of inspired enthusiasm. Of these the first are the best gifts of all time; to the second triad and the third we shall not determine what magic or mystery belong. In any case the recital carries us back to an epoch of enthusiasm such as rendered the planting of a new faith possible. But the same chapter gives us (ver. 28) a catalogue of agencies which shows us these gifts (or the most useful of them), not in their spontaneity but in relation to the organised activity of the time. This new list consists of apostles, prophets, teachers, miracles, healings, helps, governments, and kinds of tongues. Here the terms "helps, governments" introduce additional ideas suggestive of practical requirements in the business and management of affairs. Matters of finance and general administration would naturally grow with the growth of the Church; though hardly, till the age of clear faith was past, would they be placed on a level with the preaching and the teaching of the word. Now it is when these gifts are set forth as things to be desired that Paul points to one greater than any, and doubly valuable because it guides them in the exercise of others. The chapter on Charity is the greatest, because the profoundest, in the Epistles, the fullest of experience and of discernment. And this, too, is no mere human acquirement. It is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Spirit of God (Rom. 5^5).

Thereafter the subject is continued mainly to emphasise the relativity of gifts and the superiority

of prophecy over tongues. The test is practical utility; the main point is edification. "He that speaketh in a tongue edifieth himself, he that prophesieth edifieth the Church." And again, "tongues are for a sign not to them that believe, but to the unbelieving; but prophesying, not to the unbelieving but to them that believe." And again, if all prophesy, a visiting unbeliever will be compelled to recognise the presence of God ($14^{4.\ 22.\ 25}$). Here it is to be regretted that the meaning of prophecy and tongues—since both are lost arts—is not more clearly indicated. In any case the prophet spoke to edification and warning and consolation (14^{3}). And if he retained something of the ancient ecstasy, he yet spoke with the clearness of self-control and the power of effective appeal. "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets" (14^{32}).

Finally, he again appeals in behalf of order: protesting against the babel of simultaneous speech, against tongues when there is none to interpret, against the egotism that denies to each his opportunity, against the forwardness in speech of women, and against the presumption of Corinth that would confuse the customs of the world. Let the becoming be linked with the expedient.

From the great question of spiritual manifestations he passes to another which is the climax and acme of his thoughts: the question described by the term Resurrection. Paul as a Pharisee had been reared in the belief of a resurrection. This

belief was confirmed, while its crudity was corrected, by the luminous vision of the Lord. Not a natural body but a spiritual, not a re-creation of flesh and blood but a heavenly transfiguration into a more blessed existence, was what Paul looked forward to. God, who had raised up Jesus, would also by His indwelling and transforming Spirit quicken and immortalise our mortal bodies. But amongst the Corinthian Christians were some who denied the Resurrection. Whether, like the Sadducees, they denied a future existence, or rather, like the Platonists, believed only in a bodiless immortality, is not indicated. Paul in his masterly manner refuses to distinguish degrees of non-Christian belief. Life in a risen Saviour was the alpha and omega of his faith.

The chapter begins with a statement of the Christian assurance of the Resurrection of Christ (1–11). The form of the statement is valuable as an indication of the early preaching of Paul and the apostles: death for our sins, according to prophecy; resurrection as seen and testified by many. The evidence here given of the Resurrection is important, as it is independent of the gospel narratives. Appearances to Peter and to James, twice to the apostles, and once to a large assembly are recalled; and last of all, "to me also." These gave to Paul the feeling of historic certainty, and on this basis of fact he placed a more general doctrine. If there is no resurrection, he argues (on the method of *elenches*), that is to say, if the supernatural is impossible, then the historic

Resurrection is untrue, and your faith is vain, and our preaching is false, and we are a pitiable lot (12–19). And we have many vanities, such as baptism for the dead; and my own privations and perils (29–32). But there is a second question; the question not of fact, but of form. How and with what body are they raised? Here Paul points to the variety of nature, and trusts to the power of God. Amongst bodies celestial there is a higher glory, in which doubtless the risen glory will share. But an answer to the "how?" is best suggested by the analogy of the seed-corn. There we see dissolution made the starting-point of a new and larger life. And so in the fulness of faith Paul anticipates a greater future: sown in corruption, dishonour, weakness, raised in incorruption, glory, power. This takes him to his final principle. This life derived from Adam is psychic: the new life derived from Christ is pneumatic. The one is adapted to this world, the other to a world to be. They mark successive stages in the onward call of God. Adam is less than Christ, as the earthly is less than the heavenly, as the merely living is less than the life-giver. And thus our present existence is little compared with that stage when we will be conformed to the image of His glory. For to bear the image of the heavenly, transformed into the likeness of the Son of God, is the goal and crown of human aspiration and attainment.

The closing section (chap. 16) is chiefly personal. He, however, gives orders concerning

the collection, which at the time was no small part of the Church's policy. This request (as we may infer from 2 Cor.) was readily responded to. His tour of next summer (as he then intended) is indicated. There is a reference to Timothy, who some time before was despatched on a mission from which he is expected to return via Corinth. Also a pleasing reference to Apollos, who is too busy elsewhere to turn and struggle with the strife of Corinth. The exhortation (13–18) seems to us non-Pauline; the terminology is of the second group. It is an addendum that seemed necessary to the editor. But 19–24 are unmistakably Paul's, though they contain the unexpected anathema.

Between the First and Second Epistles must be placed a period of approximately a year. The references in 2 Cor. 8^{10} 9^{2} (though the phrase common to these sentences should perhaps be rendered, "since last year") naturally refer to 1 Cor. 16^{1}, and the date of the receiving of the First Epistle. The Second Epistle preceded by perhaps a month or two the three months wintering in Greece. It is therefore not later than October. The course of events since the First Letter is little known, but between them intervened the occasion of indignant reproach. That storm is now almost over. The Second is not, like the First, an elaborate handling of emergent questions. It does not in the same degree preserve for us the features of a primitive Church. It is of less historical and of less ethical and practical value. But it gives perhaps a fuller portrait and a truer

image of its author, and in chaps. 3–5 it gives a more striking presentation of the essential doctrines of Christianity. It is characterised also by a new note, the blending of personal afflictions with the sufferings of Christ.

He has to tell them not only of the grief which his last letter to them contained, but of subsequent scenes of violence at Ephesus when he despaired even of life (1^{8}). And there was the long suspense, with the keen disappointment at Troas in the non-arrival of Titus, followed, however, by the great joy when at Philippi they met. In these two chapters (in which also he pleads for the forgiveness of the offender whom they have punished) we see, as nowhere else, the deep tenderness of the man. And they lead up to the following chapters ($3–6^{10}$) containing the substance of the Epistle, which are a setting forth of the greatness of the apostolic office, with Paul's own qualifications, experiences, and services. This personal note of assertion is not the intrusion of egotism, but the necessary counteraction of reactionary emissaries who with letters of commendation have come amongst them to undermine his influence. Here, as in the former Epistle (cf. 1 Cor. 15^{10}), Paul speaks with a harmony of humility and consciousness of greatness such as is rare amongst men. In its theological aspect chap. 3 indicates the greatness of the Christian ministry in comparison with that of the Old Testament. Here we have the line of thought followed out in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The two covenants are contrasted as the Old and the

New, the temporary or transient and the abiding or permanent, as the letter and the spirit, as the messages of condemnation and of righteousness, as the ministration of law leading to death and the ministration of the Spirit giving life. Therefore if the first was with pomp and outward glory, the second has a glory that surpasseth. The passage that follows is difficult, partly from Paul's allegorising tendency and partly from the abruptness of his transitions, partly also from the nature of the case, since Moses was a mediator as well as a worshipper. Paul claims for himself and for all Christians, on account of their greater Covenant and better hope, a quality of confidence or courage or freedom or holy boldness such as did not belong to the Old Dispensation. He uses the two great terms παῤῥησία (prominent in our second group and in John) and ἐλευθερία—boldness and liberty. A veil stood between the Jew and the truth of God. That veil was first on the face of Moses to conceal the glory of the hour, or to prevent the vision of a glory that was not then destined to abide. But through the subsequent history the veil was on the hearts of the people—the veil of moral blindness. But in Christ the veil disappears. The entrance of His word giveth light. Where His spirit is there is liberty. Artificialities and forms lose their power, and the things of the inward nature take their place. It is therefore with unveiled vision or the free exercise of mind (or, in other words, with the clear intuition and consciousness of truth) that the Christian looks unto his Lord ; and steadfastly

beholding in Him who is the mirror of God the eternal glory, he begins to be transformed into the likeness which is heavenly. Hence it is that Paul perseveres, and (whatever enemies may say) lives a life of sincerity and uprightness "by the manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." It is true that now as in the past many are blinded and cannot discern the Divine; but we have been illuminated by the creative source of light, so as to be able to see the light of the knowledge of His glory in the face of Christ, to understand, therefore, the gospel of the glory of Christ who is the image of God, and consequently, for your benefit, to proclaim that Christ Jesus is Lord. Here then we have the fundamental conceptions of Christ as, on the one hand, the Image of God, in whose face or character is revealed the glory of the eternal Godhead, and, on the other, as the Lord (the exalted Prince and Saviour to whom every knee must bow). To these two conceptions, which arose from the light which flashed on the apostle's soul at his conversion, is to be added that other stated above ($3^{17.\ 18}$), which identifies the Lord and the Spirit.

From this view of the greatness of Christianity the apostle passes to the frailty of the preacher and his struggling efforts upheld by God (4^{7}–5^{10}). The treasure is in earthen vessels. But the blending of affliction and courage is such as to make Paul feel himself already a participator both in the Crucifixion and in the Resurrection ($4^{10.\ 11}$). This again is described as the outward man decaying, the

inward man renewed day by day. There is nothing here of ethical contrast (as in Eph. 4^{22-24}). According to the theology of Paul, the future life was anticipated in the "earnest of the Spirit." Already he was passing from one stage of existence to another. The psychic or natural man was failing; the spiritual or immortal was being strengthened. Such being the case, his thoughts were being fixed on the unseen and the eternal. And even now he feels a longing to escape from this bodily and burdened life into the richer and happier state, "swallowed up of life." In any case we labour desirous of pleasing God, conscious that to Him we are responsible for our service, and that all things will be made fully manifest.

Thus he passes to the greatness of his office or vocation (5^{11}–6^{10}). This brings up the greatness of the work, as the first section did of the Person, of Christ. The work for which Christ died (and in whose death His people died) is nothing less than the reconciliation of the world to God. The message of the apostle is the word of reconciliation. The office is that of an ambassador of God for Christ, charged with the appeal: be ye reconciled to God. The desire is that as Christ died for man, men should live unto God; in order that, as He became sin on our behalf, we might become the righteousness of God in Him. With such aims, with the knowledge on the one hand of the terrors of judgment, with the vision on the other of men made new in Christ, he persists through all persecutions; the love of Christ constraining him. The

section closes with that wonderful sentence (6^{1-10}) in which, in a long succession of clauses or descriptive phrases, the apostle pictures the chequered life of one who is "sorrowing yet always rejoicing, poor yet making many rich, having nothing and yet possessing all things."

Such is the substance of the thought of the Epistle. Having set it forth he makes the direct appeal, which is the primary purpose of the letter, for cordiality of affection between him and the Corinthian Church (6^{11-13} 7^{2-16}). The passage is marred in our text by an irrelevant and non-Pauline interpolation on the relations of Christians with heathens and the sin of intermarriage. But the reader can easily pass from Paul's statement of the enlargement of his affections (6^{11}) to the appeal "open your hearts to us" (7^{2}). Such an appeal carries a confession that he had been perhaps unduly severe. The words that follow (7^{5-16}) go back on the situation that caused distress; on the rousing and self-justification and manifold action of the Church in the matter, on the gratification felt by Titus, on the apostle's own comfort and courage.

Then, lastly, as we must suppose, he comes to the matter of the collection, with regard to which he is able to combine pleasing acknowledgment with further appeal. It has been doubted whether the two chapters 8, 9, belong to the same letter, chapter 8 being sufficient, and 9^{1} like a new beginning, and the tone and diction being slightly different. Yet both are from Macedonia and of the same

date (8^{10} 9^{2}). All that can be said is that in the second chapter (9) the same subject is freshly reconceived, and that thus the grace of liberality obtains a more ample recommendation. In 8^{9}, according to Paul's manner of dignifying common things, we have the first of the two statements of the kenosis: "though he was rich yet he became poor"; a mysterious theme which Paul refers to only for the new and powerful motive supplied for moral life. Apart from this sentence the chief interest of these chapters is in the light they throw on the mind and heart of the apostle.

The closing chapters (10–13) probably belong to another and earlier letter. The echoes of the early factors are still in them, combined with threatened judicial investigation (13^{1}). They possibly belong to the letter in which Paul announced a visit direct from Corinth which he did not carry into effect (2 Cor. 1^{15-17}). In any case, they are near the close of the Ephesian ministry. Their permanent interest is not theological but autobiographical. Two questions allow room for disputation, Paul's visions or ecstasies, and the weakness described as a thorn in the flesh. In these and throughout we have the elements of portraiture: the author's assertion of apostolic authority, his earnestness and humour, his simple trust, his self-sacrificing love, his determination to maintain discipline. He does not hesitate to assert equality in birth, in knowledge, in services, in sufferings, in revelations, in achievements ($11^{5.\ 22-28}$ $12^{1.\ 7.\ 12}$), with any "pre-eminent apostles" that may be

named as his supposed superiors. And again, these chapters preserve a memorial of the apostolic age; in respect, on the one hand, of its spirit of controversy, its antagonisms and counter-activities, its undisciplined freedom, its unwillingness to accept in its fulness the new ethical spirit, and its unconsciousness of the requirements of courtesy, propriety, and reverence; in respect, on the other hand, of the intensity of the faith and life and active energy of the apostle, whom we see as an indignant father asserting his authority over children that have grieved and stabbed him to the quick but cannot forfeit his affection. For our modern ideas of politeness and restraint were quite unknown to the Corinthian converts; though beneath the rudeness, the recklessness, and the quarrelsomeness there was an abundance of active intelligence capable of being fashioned into types that would reveal the power of a new source of spiritual life.

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians has never quite found its own. It is usually regarded as, in comparison, second-rate. To us it seems not inferior to any other part of the apostle's writings. Chapters 3–5 contain a statement of Christianity which is profound and powerful. And if the note of this section is brevity, there is fulness throughout the thirteen chapters in the manifestation of the author's wonderful personality. But the doctrinal section may be further studied as a link between 1 Corinthians and Romans, reminding us of the latter in its doctrine of reconciliation, in its conception of liberty, in its groanings of the wearied body, and in Christ as

the end of the Law or the supplanting of the Old Covenant by a higher ministration of grace. And on such themes the two Epistles to Corinth will be found mutually interpretative and complementary.

Elsewhere we have discussed two paragraphs (1 Cor. 15^{20-35}, 2 Cor. 6^{14}–7^{1}) which seem clearly not in the style of Paul, but were probably added by the author of the second group. To these must be added in the former Epistle $3^{16.\ 17}$, where the epithet "holy" and the later idea of the temple are non-Pauline; and $16^{13.\ 18}$, where such terms as watch, be strong, I beseech, refreshed, saints, coming, *οἰκία*, *ὑστέρημα*, reveal the second author. And to the reference here to Stephanas must be added the previous correction 1^{16} (which contains, besides *οἶκον*, a use of *λοιπὸν* which appears again in 2 Cor. 13^{11}, 1 Thess. 4^{1}). Exactly parallel is 2 Cor. 13^{11}, the closing exhortation of the latter Epistle, which contains half a dozen marks of its origin: perfected (ethically), comforted, be peaceful, God of Peace, *λοιπὸν* and *τὸ αὐτὸ*; and to these must be added "saints," verse 13; while verse 14 is elsewhere considered and assigned to Silas. These little points, then, seem to us to show that both the Corinthian Epistles were edited for publication by the author of our second group; and this seems in harmony with another phenomenon to which we now call attention.

The Second Epistle has exercised a marked influence on the language of the second group. Thus (1) the exordium "Blessed be the God and

Father of . . ." is imitated in 1 Pet. 1^3 and in Eph. 1^3; also in Ephesians the phrase "an apostle . . . through the will of God." (2) The contrast of the Old and New Covenants is developed in Hebrews. (3) The conception of Christ as the image of God is in substance in Hebrews (in the letter, in Colossians); cf. also Eph. 4^{24}. (4) More manifestly derived is the description of the Spirit as an earnest *ἀῤῥαβών* (1^{22} 5^5) reproduced in Eph. 1^{14}; and along therewith in 1^{22}, Eph. 1^{14} is the other figure "sealed." (5) The conception of *παῤῥησία* (3^{12}) is developed in Hebrews and Ephesians (and 1 John). Besides these many terms reappear in a modified sense. Thus (6) the idea of reconciliation is restated in Ephesians. (7) The terms "renewed" and "transformed," which in Paul are not ethical but substantial and spiritual, reappear in Ephesians and Rom. 12^2 in an exclusively ethical sense. (8) The term Light, by which Paul expresses spiritual knowledge or mental illumination in matters of faith, is transferred to the moral change from the darkness of heathenism. Other terms as "glory" or the "inner man" might be cited. Our sole point is not that ideas were borrowed, but that the author of our second group had this Epistle in his possession and that, especially in writing Ephesians, he used it to aid in giving a Pauline colouring to that exposition of Pauline doctrine. Of this fact the instances (1) and (4) just given are conclusive. We have thus two points that agree: editorial additions to the Epistle in the style of our second group, and evidences of the influence within that group.

Another fact which we have noted is that there is no evidence that this Epistle was in early circulation. Yet it was known to this author when 1 Peter was written. The natural conclusion is that, after the death of Paul, Silas revisited Corinth and was entrusted by the Church there with the duty of preparing for publication, or for permanent preservation, whatever letters of the apostles they possessed. These and other suggestions may be made, yet the exact details must remain for ever unknown.

CHAPTER IV

SUBSEQUENT EPISTLES OF PAUL

THE Corinthian Epistles belong to the climax of Paul's career, but they do not exhaust the chapter to which they belong. The eager apostle having completed his visits in Macedonia and his tour through regions of Illyricum, at last reached the capital of Achaia, and there or in the surrounding country he spent three months (Acts 20^3). In these months, and most probably in Corinth, he is supposed to have written the greatest of the expositions of Christian doctrine, his Epistle to the Romans. That Epistle as written by Paul consists of chapters 1–11, with perhaps some closing sentences absorbed in 15. The personal letter contained in 16 is now generally supposed to have been addressed to Ephesus. Such a multitude of salutations could not have been despatched to an unknown place. It speaks in every clause of intimate relationship. The fact that an elaborate general treatise should have been written to a distant city in a land which the author had never seen, and where there is not even evidence that a Church existed, is surprising enough. But it marks expansion of mind; and it shows that now the

apostle's eye was entirely fixed, not on the Jewish but on the Gentile world. It is probable also that from Aquila and Priscilla, and probably from others, he had heard much of the great city. And of course he knew it to be the key of Central and Western Europe. His plans for many years had been associated with capitals. Perhaps he spent an equal time in traversing rural regions. But to us the cities mark the successive stages of his career. He had now all but completed his work in Asia Minor and in Greece. Competent preachers were being stationed in every centre, and the new arrangement of committees of bishops (Phil. 1^{1}) was being ratified as a permanent form of organised activity. He was therefore ready to turn to a new continent, and the natural centre was Rome. His attitude is shown in Rom. 1^{7-15}. He writes not to a church but to a group of Christians, "all that are in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints." Towards them his thoughts and prayers have been unceasing; he is conscious of a personal mission, which obstacles have delayed, and he still longs for intercourse with mutual benefits and encouragement. Their faith (that is to say, the existence of a body of believing Christians in Rome) is known throughout the whole empire—for the circle and circumference are in constant communication with the centre—but greater opportunities of instruction may be desirable; and he modestly hopes to promote their edification and spiritual life. It is possible, therefore, that a second reason for the writing of the Epistle lay in the fear that his hopes

might be frustrated, and that only by this effort of his pen could he reach the believers or inquirers of distant lands. Everywhere he was being warned that his life was in immediate danger. And he may have already wished to have in readiness for the Church of the future a testamentary exposition of the faith for which he laboured and suffered. One of the features of the apostle's intellectual character was a marvellous foresight; and, now freed from all fetters of Judaism, he may have seen in the imperial city the centre and capital of the coming Christian world. If the allusion to Spain (15^{24}) is from Paul's own pen, and not simply a reminiscence of conversation, it shows that he expected to plant the new tree on the utmost boundaries that the legions had reached, and to make his sphere of action and propagation co-extensive with the Empire. But if this hope should prove simply a dream there remained this Epistle, the manifesto of his faith, which the ages to come would not willingly let die.

But whether the letter was really sent to Rome, and who conveyed it, or who received it, or how it was preserved, are questions to which the answer is unknown. The going out of Christians from the city to meet him as in chains he journeyed towards them (Acts 28^{15}) is some evidence that a communication had been received. But the matter is not clear. Again, it seems to us that while chapters 12–15 are certainly later additions of other teachers, even Paul's letter or dissertation does not present the appearance of having been in

all its parts simultaneously written. It is not, we think, a single continuous argument with unbroken evolution of ideas; but rather does it seem to contain successive strata of thought in the course of which, as in 8^3, the apostle returns to primal positions, re-stating the basis as he resumes the construction. Thus the first half ($1-5^{11}$) is a complete essay, and may have been the original letter. Chapters 6–8 are another essay, in which the mode of thought is greatly different; for now the forensic aspect has disappeared, the antithesis of flesh and spirit has been introduced, and the outlook is not so much towards peace and joy in this life as towards sonship in a life eternal. Again, chapters 9–11 are a study of history in view of the problems of the rise and election of nations. These later sections are such as the apostle might have meditated in his days of captivity. In the final result the Epistle has grown into a general treatise.

To the same period of residence in Corinth is to be assigned one of the two personal letters that have come down to us from Paul. This is a commendatory note given to a deaconess Phoebe on the occasion of her leaving Cenchrea on a visit to some city, and containing numerous salutations and compliments. The brief note with its rich humanity is such as only Paul at that time could have written. That the destination was Ephesus is to be inferred as probable from the first names mentioned—Prisca and Aquila, who went thither from Corinth a few years before (Acts $18^{18.\ 19}$), and Epenetus, the first of the converts of the province.

The names contain kinsmen or clansmen, co-workers and women-labourers, persons chosen or beloved, approved and hospitable. The term "fellow-prisoners" applied to two of special distinction must have some figurative forgotten sense. The letter is a memorial of Paul's kindliness or courtliness of manner, and of the primitive Ephesian Church. Some, however, of the leading members, such as Tychicus and Trophimus, were on service elsewhere. There is no mention as yet of bishops or deacons.

The letter contains Rom. 16 [1–16], and again probably [21–23]. In the latter part salutations are sent from the "Churches of Christ," presumably in Greece, and from eight persons named. All of these would have had personal relations with the Ephesian converts. Sosipater, one of three tribesmen (or Jews), is in the list of Paul's associates in the ministry (Acts 20[4]). So also Gaius, if the reading or punctuation ("of Derbe") in the same sentence is wrong. And a third, Erastus, bears the name of one who had assisted Paul when he was in Ephesus (19[22]). Whether his treasurership was in Corinth or in Ephesus is not clear. The list is headed by the closest of Paul's companions, young Timothy. Luke was possibly absent in Philippi. The amanuensis, Tertius, has secured for himself a vague immortality.

The apostle had resolved now, at all hazards, to return with his gathered treasure to Jerusalem. Whitsuntide, as we call it, was the suitable occasion; for the Jewish passover was obsolete, and

Pentecost had memories of inauguration. But apart from the temptation of booty, his life was in danger from fanaticism; and to baffle conspirators he unexpectedly doubled back through Macedonia. Seven associates accompany him; sufficient to meet ordinary dangers. They reach Philippi just before Easter, and the seven going ahead wait at Troas "for us." Here the historian asserts himself, either a resident or a fellow-labourer or a visitor in Philippi. He crosses with Paul, joins the seven, and when the party sets sail takes notes of the journey. His narrative minutely notices the various places passed, though he does not impart the individualising touches that would have been given by his leader. At the port of Ephesus they halt, send for the bishops (who were perhaps newly elected), and Paul, charging them regarding the duties of their office, bids them a memorable good-bye. Then they strike land on the coast of Syria, at Tyre, where the ship halts for a week, which they spend with "brethren" here discovered; then on to Cæsarea, where Philip the evangelist had for a time established himself; then overland to Jerusalem.

Who is the historian to whom we owe these details? It seems a plausible theory that Luke was a citizen of Philippi who had originally invited Paul from Troas to Macedonia, and now six years later rejoined him in the city where they made their brief acquaintance. But the plausibility does not carry us far. According to Luke's narrative (Acts 16^{10}), God called not Paul but *us* to Macedonia. It

would seem also to render unnecessary the welcome hospitality of the new convert Lydia. And it does not explain how it is that after six years of separation Luke suddenly resolved to leave his city and abandon his professional work for the companionship of Paul during the remainder of the apostle's life. The question is one of peculiar difficulty, on account of the scantiness of our information. That the "we" narratives were written by Luke is now practically beyond dispute, though it is conceivable that they are Lucan expansions of an official diary in an Aramaic original —conceivable, but highly improbable, inasmuch as the "we" would naturally have been eliminated. The minuteness of detail in the accounts of the voyages suggests a diary, but again the "we" makes it seem certain that the diarist was the historian. And if our theory that Luke's influence is traceable in the language of the Corinthian Epistles is right, the fact may be regarded as proving that Luke was in some sense a companion in labours of the apostle. So it is implied in Acts 16^{10}; and the probability is that Luke accompanied Paul from Ephesus to Philippi and there waited for orders. It is virtually certain also that he was one of the company in the earliest journey. Possibly his position was that of a private secretary, whose movements depended on the will of his leader.

The speech at Miletus has a second interest in its tone of sorrowful pathos. We have, of course, not Paul's words but a summary, and the circumstances of the situation as they were remembered

twenty years later. The gloomy anticipations of Paul and the bitter sorrow of the elders are remembered from the fact that it was a final farewell. Here are the first of the undrying tears shed over the bier of the apostle.

The arrival in Jerusalem was the close of Paul's freedom. At the sight of him pent-up wrath burst forth, and with difficulty his life was saved. But the fury of his enemies and the weakness of government made release impossible. Two years he lived in Cæsarea in comparative quiet; and then two years more in Rome, farther off from the rage of the Jews, in conditions of comfort such as are implied in the words "in his own hired dwelling . . . none forbidding him" to unfold the gospel. But the empire had feet of clay. It was the day of Nero, and the web was slowly weaving. Two years—and the tale is ended.

Two Epistles remain to be discussed—Galatians and Philippians. The latter belongs to the closing year in Rome; the former is critically difficult.

Galatians is an outburst of indignation as remarkable as 2 Cor. 10–13. But the question is not personal or moral: it is a relapse from the spirit of Christianity. The Epistle, though, according to Paul's manner, partly autobiographical, is concerned with one idea. The expositor's division into three parts is utterly unreal. The one theme is the liberty or spirituality of the gospel. Paul has heard that the Galatians are lapsing into the rites and formalities of Judaism. With fiery indignation he remonstrates, appealing to them to

stand fast in the freedom with which Christ makes His people free, and to produce higher and better elements of life, such as are the fruit of the Spirit and the proof of the reality of their faith.

Who were the Galatians, and why did they relapse, and when? These questions, though practically unimportant, constitute one of the puzzles of N.T. historical criticism.

The difficulty is partly due to the diversity of designations then existing in the empire. There is also uncertainty with regard to the completeness of the narratives in *Acts*.

Galatia is a name that included various districts of a large tract of country in the centre of Asia Minor. It extended almost from north to south, or from the Euxine to Pamphylia on the eastern Mediterranean. The largest division was North Galatia, to which belonged the capital Ancyra, and farther eastward Tavium — towns hundreds of miles remote from any place in which it can with certainty be said that Paul was ever known to be. South Galatia, on the other hand, included Lycaonia, Pisidia, and the region of the First Missionary Journey. Another word of uncertain meaning, coupled with it, is Phrygia, which, however, in Paul's time consisted mainly of two parts—Phrygia-Asiana more westward, and Phrygia-Galatica, which included Pisidia but not Lycaonia. It denoted a limited region north of Lystra and Derbe containing the towns Antioch (in Pisidia) and Iconium. The dispute is whether in Acts

16^{6} 18^{23} this limited district is meant, or whether the terms Phrygia and Galatia are to be taken separately, in succession, and made to include a much larger territory. The latter view prevailed until it was shaken by Sir W. M. Ramsay's researches and expositions.

The Galatians of the N.T. were a group of churches (1^{2}) founded by Paul and revisited (4^{13}). The reference in 1 Cor. 16^{1} shows that they were revisited (whether for the first or second time) and charged with the duty of making a collection just before the apostle on his Third Missionary Journey settled at Ephesus. They are therefore to be identified with or included in what Luke describes as "the region of Galatia and Phrygia" and the "upper country" (Acts 18^{23} 19^{1}). Are we to identify this "Galatic country and Phrygia" with the "Phrygian and Galatic country" of 16^{6}? The slightly different designation is disconcerting, and the phrase in 18^{23} seems to favour the distinctness of the terms and the restriction of Phrygia to the westward division (Phrygia-Asiana), which included the valley of the Lycus. Yet this is contrary to what is known of the foundation of churches there; as yet there were none there to be visited. The probable view, therefore, is that in both instances one and the same region is meant. In 16^{6} the precedence of Phrygia shows that it cannot be a district west of Galatia. Now, if Paul had founded new churches (farther north or elsewhere) in Galatic Phrygia (or Phrygian Galatia) on the occasion of his Second Missionary Journey (16^{6}),

such churches might claim to be those of the Epistle. But no such inference can be naturally drawn from Luke's account. He tells us that Paul revisited Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and with Timothy went on his way through the cities. And they went through Phrygia-Galat., looked towards Asia (the province) . . . thence over against Mysia . . . and down to Troas. These passages show that the route of Paul was not at all northward towards Ancyra and the cities of Northern Galatia, but westward towards the provinces and cities that were nearest Europe. Luke seems to mean that Paul first moved forward with a view to preaching in "Asia," and tried to turn southward on his left towards such cities as Hierapolis and Laodicea, but was forbidden; and that then he turned to his right in precisely the opposite direction, as if he hoped to reach the far-famed cities of Northern Bithynia. But again, when he was in the south of Bithynia, about in line with Troas, he was checked; and accordingly he turned westward to the coast. Now to this journey (16^{6-8}) Luke assigns no work of evangelisation. We know not if there were important towns on their route. Paul was feeling his way through inhospitable and unfruitful regions, confronted by official or popular hostility, influenced by motives and circumstances unrecorded; but directed (as he believed) by a Divine providence. No church is mentioned that belongs to the long route from Iconium to Troas. None probably existed (though there may have been isolated believers),

except in the four cities mentioned and in small towns of the same neighbourhood.

Once more, in the Third Missionary Journey (*i.e.* from Antioch to Ephesus, Acts 18^{23} 19^{1}), the field of labour could not have embraced Northern or even Central Galatia. To suppose so would be to discredit the narrative and Luke's interest in his subject. Paul simply went on a quick visit to old disciples — passing through Lycaonia or Pisidia and the north-easterly parts of the province of Asia—his mind being entirely set on a new mission to Ephesus. The "upper country" (19^{1}) is distinguished from some nearer and more familiar route, perhaps from the region of the Lycus valley. It must have been Phrygian more than Galatian; and accordingly the text seems to distinguish Galatia and Phrygia as parts successively traversed. It is therefore, as far as evidence exists, practically certain that there were no churches of Galatia except those founded on the First Missionary Journey by Barnabas and Paul; with others of the same neighbourhood subsequently added thereto—churches strengthened and established and perhaps increased in number by two subsequent visits of Paul.

The question who the Galatians were would be doubly interesting if it could be shown that they were Celts. According to history and etymology, the original Galatians were Gauls or Celts who migrated eastward two or three centuries before Christ. But alas! Paul writes to his churches as if they were composed of Jews. And though there

were doubtless several members of mixed or alien race, the influential portion would still be of those who came over from the synagogue. It is true that 4^{8} assumes a pagan element. But we fear that the words were not inapplicable to many of Jewish descent in regions where for centuries "the name of God was blasphemed" through their unworthiness. And it is also possible enough that even Jews or Israelites had received into their blood somewhat of the racial characteristics of the Aryan and other tribes that were diffused around them. If the fickleness of the Celt became the fickleness of the entire population there is nothing therein to contradict the ways of history. The whole Epistle becomes unintelligible if it was pagan apostasy to idols and not a relapse to Jewish legalism that constituted the great offence. And the presence of a preponderating Jewish element corresponds with what is known of Southern Galatia (cf. Acts 13^{14} 14^{1}).

The date is a vexed and difficult question. Apart from eccentric reconstructions, it has been argued that the Epistle was written from Corinth on the first visit, and on the second visit, from Antioch at all possible times, from Ephesus, from Cæsarea, from Rome. The chief note of time is the expression το πρότερον (4^{13}). This is usually held to mean "on the former of two occasions," but in 1 Tim. 1^{13} (which we believe is by the same writer, Luke) it simply means "formerly," and so usually. But according to this meaning the number of past visits is irrelevant. The term ταχέως (1^{6})

has been supposed to mean that the relapse quickly followed the founding of the church (hence the argument for the first residence in Corinth); but the reference may be to the suddenness of the defection as a thing the apostle had no reason to anticipate. The meaning "suddenly" as distinguished from "shortly" is seen in Luke 14^{21}, 1 Tim. 5^{22}; and in the latter case we might translate "rashly." So here also there is no stable argument. The statement that Paul preached *το πρότερον* because of an infirmity—the reference is to illness—is also puzzling. Their past conduct is cited simply to throw into greater relief their present disaffection. Again, it is held by many that the general argument of the Epistle places it near to 2 Corinthians and Romans, and therefore about the date of the second visit to Corinth. In our opinion the affinities are closest to Rom. 6–8, but we see nothing to determine the question of priority. A recent monograph dates it at Ephesus, on the Third Missionary Journey, immediately before 1 Corinthians. Zahn places it at Corinth, on the Second Missionary Journey, and therefore two years earlier. These two views go with the North and South Galatian theories respectively. Both rest on a false interpretation of *το πρότερον*, and both disregard the argument based on affinities of thought.

The oldest theory, stigmatised by Dr. Moffatt as "curious," dates the Epistle from Rome. Reasons supporting the antique opinion that this is in reality an Epistle of the Captivity seem to us very strong. (1) Such is the subscription at

the end, indicative of ancient tradition or opinion. (2) Two sentences have been held to indicate captivity. "I bear branded on my body the marks" (6^{17}),—these words seem most natural if the weight of the chain was in the apostle's mind. The term *βαστάζω* means "carry," and so it is used of burdens twice in this same chapter ($6^{2.5}$, cf. Luke 10^{4}). The other text is the reference to persecution (5^{11}, cf. 4^{9}). (3) A reasonable explanation of the Galatian apostasy may be found in the supposed fall of the apostle. He has been unseen, let us say, for five years. The Galatians have heard that after two years of imprisonment in Cæsarea he has been carried away to the dungeons of the imperial city. Simultaneously with his removal we may be assured that an active attempt was set on foot to undo his work in the churches he had founded amongst Jewish peoples. The reaction in Galatia is not simply whimsical. Rather would it be the result of the absence of Pauline leaders on the one hand, of the presence of Judaising emissaries on the other, and of a belief that the apostle's cause was lost. (4) On the ground that 4^{10} refers to the sabbatical year, Hausrath contends that the date must be the beginning of such year; and he informs us that the year extended from September 53 to September 54. But the argument is equally valid for a date seven years later, *i.e.* for the winter of 60 A.D. (or 61). Paul may have unexpectedly received unfavourable accounts (through the arrival of Crescens, 2 Tim. 4^{10}) soon after he arrived in

Rome. (5) The affinities of the Epistle are with Rom. 5^{12}–8. There seems little resemblance to 1 or 2 Corinthians. The phrase καινὴ κτίσις belongs to 2 Cor. 5^{17} and Gal. 6^{15}, but in the latter case it is uttered not as part of an argument but as a familiar word. The New Covenant (3^{15-17}) is conceived in a manner quite different from what we find in 2 Cor. 3. The first Covenant is now referred to Abraham, not Moses. This recalls the argument of Rom. 4. Of further resemblances to Romans, the chief are the contrasts of law and grace, of flesh and spirit, the ideas of adoption, of being led by the Spirit, and of bearing the fruit thereof, and the use of figures or allegories (cf. Rom. 7). Baur contended that the statement in Romans was more deliberate and mature. But the conception of freedom is bolder in Galatians than in Rom. 6, and the fruit of the Spirit seems more fully elaborated in Galatians (5^{22}) than in Romans (6^{22} 7^{4}), where we see the apostle thinking out the subject. The Hagar passage may be compared with Rom. 9, which as part of a larger argument in the study of history might reasonably, but not certainly, be placed later. The purpose of the law (because of transgressions, Gal. 3^{19}, Rom. 5^{20}) is part of this historical study, and is one of the subtlest or strongest points of connection. Again, the conception of sonship (or adoption) is approached in different ways: in Gal. from the side of the law or history, in Rom. from the thought of the new spiritual life; but it would be unsafe to say that either form is prior to the other.

On the whole the subject-matter of the

Epistles points to a twofold division: (i) 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Rom. $1-5^{11}$; (ii) Rom. $5^{12}-11$, Galatians, Philippians. The soteriology of the one division is gathered up in Rom. $3-5^{11}$, of the other in Rom. 6–8. And between the two a certain mental growth is discernible. In the former Paul's mind is equally masterful, but perhaps not so rich and masterly. (6) Another line of argument lies in the Lucan influence. In a later chapter we indicate that this influence in the sphere of expression pervades the two Epistles, Galatians and Philippians, and between these two there are striking points of similarity, while in both salutations are sent from "the brethren that are with me" (Gal. 1^{2}, Phil. 4^{21}). It is therefore probable that the circumstances under which they were written were nearly the same. The resemblances between Galatians and the Pastorals are also numerous; and on this ground conservative critics should place Galatians late. But a scientific investigation will discover the hand of Luke. (7) Once more the tenderness of the closing verses (6^{11-16}), and the reference to his own handwriting in large letters, are most intelligible if we suppose that he was now a prisoner.

The Epistle is a series of arguments in behalf of the Pauline gospel. That gospel, in the first place, is not man's but God's. "It came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ." This leads back to the story of his life, his persecution of the saints, then his conversion, his retirement into Arabia, and his subsequent ministry, and thereafter the recognition at the Council of Jerusalem of his

authority and doctrine. His conversion was accompanied by a call from God to be a preacher to the Gentiles. It was followed by a course of revelation which extended over the entire gospel which he preached. Every other gospel is false. Fourteen years later, and when Paul had laboured successfully in Syria and Cilicia (and also in Southern Galatia), the question was brought before the Church in Jerusalem. Then the apostolic fathers gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, acknowledging them as the apostles of the Gentiles. That was the trial of the case and the authoritative judgment. No retrocession is possible; no reconsidering, or wavering, or temporising. To restore a Judaic salvation by the law is to build again what has been destroyed, is to assert that Christ died for nought. In the course of this statement he utters one of those great sentences which show the moral superiority of the new faith: "I live, and yet no longer I: but Christ liveth in me. . . ." (2^{20}). Here we are parallel with 2 Cor. 4^{16}; but the statement is simpler, fuller, deeper, richer, the thought of the man who writes "to me to live is Christ" (Phil. 1^{22}).

Next, he reminds them that the gospel was fully preached to them, and its benefits clearly received: Jesus Christ openly set forth crucified, and the Spirit received by faith (3^{1-25}). With such a beginning are they to seek completion through external forms? After having suffered for their faith are they to turn their back on it and return to worthlessness? Will they thus find spiritual

nourishment and power? At this point he introduces his argument about the Old Testament, which conceives Abraham and not Moses as the true founder of true religion. Abraham is the first of those who found salvation by faith, and in him (not in Moses) is the promise of blessing to the nations. The law with its severity and strictness is a thing which men should be pleased to escape from. It cannot justify, it cannot give the Spirit; it can only condemn. Christ redeemed us from its curse, and made it possible for man to receive the life of God. Why, then (the sceptic may ask), should there have been a law at all? It was necessary tutorially, in order to make men conscious of sin and to constrain them until they should be fit for freedom. But it has now served its purpose. It has fulfilled the design of leading up to the fulfilment of the promises. And now the greater day has dawned. The gift of righteousness, of the Spirit, or of life is brought nigh. A loftier status is reached. Ye are sons of God; heirs, according to the promise, of eternal blessing (3^{1-29}).

Chapter 3 is the central argument; chapter 4 is illustrative; but principles continue to be asserted, and the emphasis is thrown on freedom. The legal elements to which they are returning are not only miserable rudiments; they are a yoke of bondage. They are an abnegation of spiritual birthright and true manhood. The apostle urges a threefold exhortation: to realise sonship, to let Christ be formed within them, to stand fast in the purchased freedom.

Again, the moral superiority is set forth, with warnings against misconception (5^{2-26}). Christ is the source of power; and to trust in the law is to be severed from that source. The Christian life is a waiting in faith for the hoped-for righteousness. And the righteousness thus looked forward to and ministered through the Spirit must incomparably transcend all merely legal attainments. This thought is more fully expanded in Phil. 3^{9}. Here also (5^{6}) we have in supplement of 2^{20} the apostle's view of the activity of faith as working, energising through love. But possible dangers from the new wine of gospel truth are recognised. Rumours may have come of rivalries or revelries in Galatia. "Use not your freedom for an occasion to the flesh, but through love serve one another" (5^{13}). This is the paradox of Christian liberty. And then he closes the argument (as in Rom. 7) with presenting the antagonism of flesh and spirit, to which is due the inability of men to fulfil their purposes or moral judgments (5^{17}). Here is given the contrast between the works of the flesh, which are manifest and manifold and empty of gain, and on the other hand the "fruit of the Spirit," which proves its reality by the quality of the graces that constitute the nobility and blessedness of life. The graces are in three triads, and Christ's people who have crucified the flesh have attained to the distinction of being led by, of living by, and of walking by the Spirit of God.

That is the end of the Epistle. Chapter 6^{1-10} gives some closing general advice, in which the

apostle urges mutual sympathy and conscientious service. Then follow in Paul's own hand some sacred sentences charged with Divine tenderness and holy fidelity. "Far be it from me to glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom the world has been crucified to me and I unto the world." Nothing avails but a "new creation." "As many as walk by this rule peace be upon them and mercy, and upon the Israel of God." With these words, and sighs drawn from the depths, the apostle bids to the first of his groups of churches an everlasting farewell.

Our next document is the Epistle to the Philippians. Of the place and date of its despatch there can be little doubt. It is an Epistle of the Captivity written in bonds ($1^{7.\ 13.\ 14.\ 17}$) and in the immediate prospect of trial. The situation accords with Rome rather than Cæsarea in the reference to Cæsar's household, in the freedom of personal intercourse, in the indications of a growing cause, and perhaps even in the definite fact of a coming trial. And again, it is widely separated in tone and temper and feeling from the Epistles that preceded the imprisonment. The apostle has become old; the westward campaign is no longer contemplated; if released he will return to Philippi. He is world-wearied, and but for the love of his children in the faith would be eager to depart. And yet, inwardly ardent as ever, he fixes his eyes on the spiritual heights and presses towards the goal—the likeness and the presence of his

Lord. The Epistle, then, is a message from the heart of Paul to his best beloved Church. He had sent gifts and remembrances by a messenger, Epaphroditus, who, after a time of service and after illness, is now returning, and takes with him this account of the apostle's mind and state. The Epistle is perhaps less systematic than any other, for it is scarcely at all doctrinal or controversial. No vexed questions of thought or practice have been referred to him for judgment; and no departures from his teaching call forth correction or remonstrance. Doubtless, beneath the surface there are matters requiring fatherly advice. In Philippi, too, as we infer, there was a Judaising element; and, as elsewhere, there are elements of discord. But the note of pain or anger is absent. There has been no denial of the faith, no repudiation of the genuine gospel, no secret undermining of its fundamental principle. Accordingly the case is met by gentle warning or affectionate exhortation.

It was impossible, however, for Paul to write without allowing some of the doctrinal thoughts of which his mind was full to break through his conversational utterance. Thus in each of what may be called the three sections of the Epistle we find one important indication of a branch of Christian dogma. Thus (1) in chapter 2, while engaged in moral exhortation, he introduces a parallel and pattern in the humiliation and exaltation of Christ. The statement of the humiliation implies the doctrines of the pre-existence of Christ, of His essential Divinity, of

the incarnation and of His voluntary self-abnegation through the successive stages of the laying aside of the glory, becoming man, entering on a life of service and submitting unto death (2^{5-8}). The passage bristles with disputable points, such as the form of God and the *kenosis*. The moral meaning, elsewhere expressed in the words, "though He was rich yet for your sakes He became poor," is what occupies Paul's mind. Exactness of definition or interpretation is not therefore to be sought. Broadly, the words "equality" and "form of God" denote that heavenly glory or Divine image (2 Cor. 4^4) necessarily belonging to Him who was the agent in all creation (1 Cor. 8^6). No reference is made here to the final cause of the incarnation or to the special significance of the Cross. The purpose is moral, and the emphasis is thrown (as in Gal. 2^{20}) on the voluntariness of the great Sacrifice.

The humiliation was rewarded with the exaltation. This is repeated in Heb. 12^2, and was perhaps regarded as an illustration of the moral law inculcated by Jesus. The "name above every name" is, we suppose, "Lord," as that term was understood by those who had been accustomed to use it of Jehovah. The epithets, heavenly, earthly, and underground are a strong assertion of the universality of Christ's authority. They perhaps indicate the commencement of that mode of thought which extended the redeeming work of Christ beyond our world and placed His authority and rule above all created being. Already in

Rom. 3^{25} Paul gave Christ's death a retrospective virtue; and it would be contrary to his fundamental conception of the Person of Christ to allow a limitation of its atoning efficacy. But to read into this text what apparently is taught in the second group, namely, the descent into Hades, would be to go beyond what the language warrants.

The second semi-doctrinal passage, dealing now with Christ's work rather than His Person, is 3^{8-11}, where in the course of his admonition the apostle is setting forth his own personal example. He strives towards the knowledge and fellowship and likeness of Christ. Here he uses in a slightly expanded form his old phrase "the righteousness of God." The usage, however, is more allied to the ethical, the righteousness being conceived in respect of its subjective appropriation. But it is sheer perversity to interpret it in the ordinary moral sense implied in such a term as "uprightness." In uprightness the apostle claims to be "blameless." What he desires is divineness. He therefore strives towards a better righteousness, "that which is through faith of Christ, the righteousness which is from God upon faith." The latter half of this clause, with the explanatory ἐκ and ἐπι, contains Luke's elucidation of a phrase that has tried the commentators. The righteousness is of course the Messianic salvation, which is revealed in the gospel as its central fact (Rom. 1^{17}). But it is now conceived less juridically, and more in respect of an eternal transformation. It is therefore not materially different from the

knowledge (γνῶσις) which is an experiential condition consisting in fellowship with Christ's sufferings and participation in His resurrection. This difficult sentence belongs to another mode of expression equally characteristic of Paul. It is parallel with 2 Cor. 4^{16}, where the outward man is decaying and the inward man renewing. The language is both ethical and hypostatic. Fellowship with Christ's sufferings means suffering, and it means learning of Christ. It means entering into His spirit; though an objective (Col. 1^{24}) significance can hardly be assumed. Similarly, resurrection from the dead means resurrection after death, but it also means a new power now; and the essential peculiarity of Paul is that he conceives the powers of the world to come (Heb. 6^{5}) as already working within. It may be observed that the last clause—"if by any means . . ."—is perhaps entirely in Luke's phraseology, the εἰ πώς and also the two unusual terms *attain* and *resurrection*, both of which are Polybian. The latter is an ἅπαξ λεγ; the former reappears in Acts 26^{7} and in Eph. 4^{13}, in future and ethical senses such as are combined here.

These are the two passages most charged with doctrine. But the second may be enlarged by sayings in chapter 1; in the prayer regarding the "fruit of righteousness," with its objective of the day of Christ ($1^{9.11}$), and in the great antithesis that expresses his profound peace: "to live is Christ, and to die is gain." This is faith both in fellowship and in resurrection; and it connects the Epistle with

Gal. 2^{20}. Again, we have in 1^{27} and 3^{20} the notable terms πολιτεύω and πολίτευμα, which are akin to Gal. 4^{26}, "the Jerusalem that is above—our mother," and point forward to the coming doctrine of the Church, "that general assembly of the first-born whose names are written in heaven" (Heb. 12). Once more, we have in the same context (3^{21}) one of the fullest statements regarding the "redemption of the body." Here for the only time in Paul's own Epistles have we Luke's term "Saviour," soon to be accepted as a permanent description of Christ's relation to His people. But it is used not of deliverance from sin merely, but of that supernatural and Divine power which can immortalise this body, transferring it to another world and transforming it according to the conditions of glorified existence there.

In this Epistle, then, we see Paul's rabbinical forms smoothed and broadened so as to lose their forensic or technical appearance; and we see also a transitional aspect pointing towards the conceptions of the next generation. The ethical element preponderates, and there are slight indications of the conception of a Church invisible.

As an ethical message the Epistle contains three main notes: harmony, steadfastness, progress. The appeal to harmony is particularised in 4^{2}, where the grace of "sweet reasonableness" (4^{5}) is commended. But it is general in 2^{1-4} and required of the whole Church. Division was a vice of many of the churches (as, *e.g.*, Corinth), but the needed virtue will grow with the acquirement of the Christ-like

qualities of lowliness and love. Compare also 2^4 with Gal. 6^2 and the contents. The note of steadfastness is a lesson learned from Galatia (3^2 4^2). This he reinforces by exhibiting his own indifference to earthly privilege. All is insignificant in comparison with Christ and the heavenly home. The incitement to progress is the most distinctive moral quality of the Epistle. The idea as applied to Christian life has already been expressed in 2 Cor. 3^{18}, Rom. 6^{19-22}, but in Philippians it is for the first time a pervading idea; Paul's own life is a striving and pressing forward (3^{13}), a struggling to apprehend and to reach a goal. His prayer for the Philippians is for abundance more and more, for an ever-increasing power of spiritual discernment, and a growing fulness of visible fruit ($1^{8.\ 9-11}$). Christian character is a good work begun by God, who will continue and perfect it. And there is also the outward progress of the Church, designated by a new word προκοπή ($1^{12.\ 25}$), another term of Luke's Polybian vocabulary. What more pleasant discovery could we have than this of the unquenchable freshness of the aged apostle! Onward and upward is his race (3^{14}), upward and also onward. Greater victories, fairer visions, loftier heights rise before his gaze. He lives in the ideal; and his ideal lives and enlarges. His last exhortation is this: Whatsoever things are true—honourable—just—lovely—gracious, whatsoever there may be of virtue or of praise, think on these things.

The third element of interest in a Pauline letter is the personal. This is of two kinds, the auto-

biographic and the self-interpretative. To the former belongs Paul's description of himself as a Pharisee, of the tribe of Benjamin, zealous of the law; to the latter the whole Epistle, though some passages are, more than others, informed and luminous with the apostle's spirit. To most of these reference has already been made. We may here add that the Epistle gives signal evidence of tender affection; of a heart full of love and gratitude to God, capable of warm friendship, intensely interested in the community and in his fellow-workers, full of gladness when he hears of well-doing, ready in behalf of others to surrender his life in sacrifice. And again, in the closing chapter, where he describes the "peace of God" that rules in his heart, we seem to see realised that tranquillity which was the *summum bonum* of the schools, and along with it the note of a joy which suffering cannot quench.

Note.—The position that these five are the distinctive Epistles of Paul being laid down, a certain qualification has to be added. The diction is not entirely Paul's. As far as words are concerned, Galatians and Philippians are more Lucan and more akin to the historians of Greece than even the Pastorals discussed below. Something of the same diction is seen in *Romans*, especially at the beginning, and again towards the end. The historical argument in Rom. 1^{18} 2^{16} is an amplification of part of the Address to the Athenians, and probably expresses what was common to the minds of Paul and Luke. Occasional Lucan terms appear all through 1 and 2 Corinthians; most frequently in 2 Cor. 10–13. Paul apparently dictated rather than wrote, and possibly not always in Greek. Luke was perhaps a paid literary assistant. But the question is intricate, and detailed examination must now be withheld.

Later Epistles

No less than eight other Epistles bear the name of Paul. These are in three divisions: the Thessalonian, the Ephesian-Colossian-Philemon, and the Pastoral groups. They will be expounded later; but as we regard the name Paul in these as simply indicative of the master of the school to which they belong, and therefore consider them as only in a second degree expressive of the distinctive Pauline doctrine, we here note only the circumstances under which they may have been written, or the relation they may bear to the life and work of Paul. It is unfortunate that there is no decisive evidence on the question whether Paul was released from captivity. The theory of an acquittal and subsequent captivity and martyrdom was anciently held; but perhaps mainly for the reason on account of which it is in modern times upheld, namely, to make the references in the Pastoral Epistles intelligible. But the cessation of the biography in Acts and the tone of the narrative (especially in reference to Miletus and Cæsarea) point otherwise. So also the absence of any evidence that goes back to the first century; while the one authoritative statement of Clement that the apostle suffered "under the prefects" (the resumption of two, instead of one, dates from 62) in no wise requires what seems the artificial theory of a second arrest. Again, there is no memorial of later years, no Epistle subsequent to Philippians which sets forth the thoughts of Paul, no record of churches founded or cities visited—save

the shadowy and contrary suggestions of Nicopolis and Spain. This is a body of negative evidence little affected by Epistles apparently later, which any discerning critic can easily know not to be Paul's. And yet these later writings must have come from disciples who knew the whole story. If there are slight discrepancies between 2 Timothy and Colossians (which Epistles we attribute to Luke and Timothy respectively), or between Acts and 2 Timothy or 1 Thessalonians, the simple explanation may be that ten or twenty years after the events the memory of one of the authors may, regarding little points of the movements of friends, have proved human. Or perhaps to men who wrote Epistles in the name of an absent master the complete verbal accuracy of statements made to call up a past situation, or perpetuate the memory of an individual, or to serve as a setting for some fresh instruction, was a matter of secondary concern. Their primary object was fulfilled.

At the same time it is to be remembered that to the Church at large, and to the general cause of truth, the actual authorship is a matter of little importance. If the Thessalonian or Ephesian Epistles are inconceivable within the lifetime of Paul, their importance is all the greater in that they interpret for us other decades and enable us to see successive stages in the full unfolding of apostolic doctrine.

The Epistles to the Thessalonians are discussed below. There is no record that the three authors were together after Paul's first residence in

Corinth. *Prima facie*, therefore, the Epistles are represented as written from Corinth. But if we regard them as the work of Silas and Timothy any later date (subsequent to the life of Paul) is possible. It is true that in 1 Thess. 1–3 we have the forms of a letter recalling past experiences and asserting the apostle's desire to revisit Thessalonica. It is therefore a possible theory that these chapters, or part of them, consist of an original communication to which the more doctrinal or apocalyptic parts were subsequently added. But it is more probable that they are the language of reminiscence constituting a suitable framework for the apocalyptic message. These reminiscences are altogether superficial. They reveal nothing of mind or heart or personality. In so far as they may appear to do so they are an echo of *Philippians*.

Two triads remain. The first consists of Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon. Ephesians, though a great Epistle, is scarcely a letter. It is a manifesto of Paulinism, setting forth Christianity as a universal religion and the Church as the pleroma of Christ. Personal elements are wanting. Only Paul is a prisoner, an "ambassador in chains." The heading "at Ephesus" (1^{1}) is of doubtful authority, and inconsistent with the text (3^{2-4}). There are no salutations.

The same situation is assumed for *Colossians*, written in the names of Paul and Timothy. Colossæ is one of the three neighbouring towns—the others being Laodicea and Hierapolis—in the

valley of the Lycus in Phrygian Asia. The Epistle seems to imply (2^1) that Paul never visited the place, though in his ministry at Ephesus some influence must have extended through all this district (Acts 19^{10}). The chief motive of the Epistle is Gnostic error in this (post-Pauline?) Christian community. Salutations are sent from Aristarchus, Mark, and Justus, who are Jews; and from Epaphras, Luke, and Demas, who are Gentiles. Epaphras (Paul's Epaphroditus; but the apostle does not use diminutives) has apparently been the evangeliser of the district; Archippus and Nymphas are saluted as chief agents of the place. The letter is borne by Tychicus and Onesimus, the latter a native of Colossæ. Timothy is joint author. The supposed situation partly agrees with, partly differs from, that of 2 Timothy. The Church, whether evangelised from Ephesus or extended from Laodicea (Rev. 3^{14}), is a result of influences that radiated from the active life of Paul. It is also a memorial of a method of instruction by circular letter.

Philemon, to whom the third is addressed, was a wealthy Christian of Colossæ; and in his house the church of which Aristippus was minister was wont to meet. The Epistle is a private letter, a note of recommendation carried by Onesimus to his former master whom he had deserted. Onesimus also is now a Christian, and has won the favour of the apostle. It is apparently implied that he had travelled to Rome and there become a Christian. As a reformed man and an accepted brother, and

under the protection of Paul's promise, he returns to his master. The letter manifests tender affection, the new Christian spirit of brotherhood in Christ, and obedience to duty. But, however charming, the language is not Paul's, and the story (cf. Col. 4^{9}) is inherently doubtful. Was it penned by Timothy after instructions from his leader, or is it a fiction of a later year, an allegory setting forth an aspect of Christian activity in the great days of the founding of the Church? Is it a literary rendering of the phrase "neither bond nor free," written to remind the next generation how superior in liberality of mind the fathers were? In any case it is not unworthy of Paul.

Let us now look at the personal references in the Pastoral triad. The Second to Timothy brings us nearest to Paul. The situation seems that of the Captivity near its close. "Erastus abode at Corinth": we missed his name from the seven (Acts 19^{22} 20^{4}). "Tychicus I sent to Ephesus"; so (Eph. 6^{21}) he was one of the seven, but when he left Paul is not told. "Trophimus I left at Miletus sick": this also recalls the journey, but creates a difficulty (Acts 21^{29}). "Salute Prisca (Paul's form) and Aquila"; unforgettable friends, perhaps still in Ephesus. "The cloak that I left at Troas" is another reminiscence of four years ago, kept alive in an Italian winter. "Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil" on the occasion, doubtless of the riot (2 Cor. 1^{8}, Acts 19^{33}): he may have been the instigator of the anti-Christian Jews. "Titus went to Dalmatia," probably when Erastus abode

in Corinth: we had lost trace of him. And there are names not mentioned in the record in *Acts*. "Only Luke is with me";—we know he was in the company, and his sole presence now is suggestive of the penmanship or authorship of this letter. "Take Mark": a pleasant instruction after a former memory; suggestive also of relations between Mark and Luke (in Colossians both Mark and Timothy are present). Other names are Crescens, off to Galatia (perhaps with Paul's Epistle), and Demas, unkindly relegated to Thessalonica (in Colossians and Philemon still present). Aristarchus (also named in Colossians-Philemon), who accompanied Paul on the voyage (Acts 27^{2}), is not now on the scene. He may have returned with Epaphroditus to his native country, Macedonia. Four Christians of Rome, one of whom became bishop (Linus), join in salutation. Three names of Asia are mentioned, two of whom disowned the apostle, while the other, Onesiphorus, greatly comforted him. None of these seems to have been known, or to have been in Ephesus, when Rom. 16 was written. But the paragraph regarding them (1^{15-18}) is inexplicably placed. There are also two Asian or Ephesian heretics (2^{17}), again referred to in 1 Tim. 1^{20}, probably leaders of post-Pauline heresies in the Church.

The names in the first half of this list accord with the time of the first Captivity, and if there were a second Captivity some years later it would be surprising to find a second journey via Troas and Miletus and the same men again in position. The difficulties seem to be, the reference to

Trophimus and the mention in Colossians of Timothy and Mark as present (though that is a difficulty for Colossians rather than for this Epistle). It makes Colossians later in respect of these two, while that Epistle is earlier in respect of Aristarchus, Demas, and Tychicus. The letter tells of the fierceness of the accusation before which all "forsook" him. The deliverance from the "mouth of the lion" is perhaps figurative (it has been explained of the Devil and of Nero), but it looks literal enough as descriptive of a threatened doom. This humiliation was not inflicted; but the impression left is that Paul was condemned, saved unto the "heavenly kingdom." The great sentence (4^{6-8}) is in reality a panegyric on the dead. Words from Paul's own lips are recalled as a dying testimony, impressive and monumental, charged with inspiration in life and with triumph in death.

The Epistle contains reference to Timothy's home and to Paul's sufferings in his First Missionary Journey. Luke was even then his companion; and it is remarkable that the only sufferings of Paul specifically mentioned in the *Acts* are those referred to in this Epistle.

In the case of 1 Timothy the historic situation seems to correspond with the first appointment of elders in Ephesus. Paul leaving for Macedonia exhorts Timothy to remain in charge. The chief reason is to counteract theosophists or heretics; but a general superintendence may be exercised. This reminiscence of Pauline movement may not quite accord with Acts; but exact accordance is

unnecessary if we suppose that the Epistle was really written to meet a situation a quarter of a century later, and that a framework of Pauline connection was necessary.

In TITUS also the interests are post-Pauline; and the historic framework is again vaguely drawn. According to the subscription, the Epistle was written from Nicopolis; and the text indicates either that Paul was there or that he expected to be soon. Possibly Paul on his last tour in Greece (after the three years in Ephesus) spent some time wintering at Nicopolis (Rom. 15^{19}); and Titus (whose name is associated with Dalmatia, which is the same thing) may have joined him there. But at this time Titus' concern was with Corinthian not Cretan troubles. The words "left I thee in Crete" suggest that he was dropped from the ship (Acts 27^{8}), but may refer to a much earlier date. Between the Council at Jerusalem, where Titus was prominent, and his mission to Corinth six years later we hear nothing of this fellow-worker of Paul. Yet missionary activity was going on in many regions whose story is untold. Again, Titus is to be relieved in Crete by Tychicus or Artemas. One tradition makes this new minister one of the Seventy, which would correspond with an early date. Another makes him Bishop of Lystra, which answers best to a later date. "Set forward Zenas and Apollos." This is subsequent to the commencement of Paul's ministry in Ephesus, but it may be prior to the date when Titus joined him there. In 1 Cor. 16^{12} Paul is in correspondence with Apollos. Crete lies

in a straight line between Alexandria and Corinth, so that a visit from Apollos was to be expected. These references enable us to surmise what extent of ground was touched by the words "the care of all the churches."

CHAPTER V

CHARACTERISTICS OF PAUL'S EPISTLES

1. *Theological*

THE theology of Paul is concerned with salvation, and is therefore, in technical language, soteriological. But the statement of it, as preserved to us, was incidental to the activities and experiences of a missionary career, and therefore cannot be considered fully systematic. It would be equally correct to describe it as Christological or Christocentric, both because the advent of Christ presented the historical basis on which the thought of the epoch arose, and because Christ as the one source of salvation was the apostle's only theme. Had Paul been writing abstract treatises, other doctrines of creation or providence, of the nature of God or of variety of being, or of duties of worship, might have held a foremost place. The address to the Athenians seems to have put in the foreground the doctrine of God; and though this may have been due to prudential motives, the fact remains that fundamentally the thought of God is paramount and all ideal theology is Theocentric. Yet from the letters of Paul it is possible to con-

struct systems Theocentric, Anthropocentric, or from the starting-points of sin and of righteousness. But the framing of systems and methods is rarely the most profitable mode of study. And the teaching of Paul will be most readily understood if it is followed along some lines of thought that to him and his readers were vital and all-important.

In the background of his system of salvation are the conceptions of sin and law and judgment. There is the broad fact of the universality of sin; there is the secondary doctrine of its derivation from Adam, which is an explanation of that universality; there is the more certain reality of its power —it is a thing that *reigns*, bringing the soul of man into servitude, evoking the wrath of God and culminating in death. Salvation is in the first instance deliverance from the guilt and the power and the doom of sin. And again, these doctrines derive their immediate importance from and through the law. To the devout Jew the law was the sacred embodiment of the spoken and entire will of God. Paul was educated in august reverence for that Divine symbol. To him it was an impersonation rather than a rule, the embodied voice of God. The law was the "strength of sin," the principle of judgment, the power that condemned. As to his colleague the "word" was living and active and sharper than a two-edged sword, so to Paul was the law. It operated inwardly, giving the knowledge of sin; but objectively also it filled the horizon. And with the vivid conceptions that the

apostle had of sin and judgment it became to him as the right arm of the avenging God.

But now comes the great antithesis of sin and righteousness, of law and grace, of wrath and salvation, of condemnation and justification, of terror and peace. Instead of fear is gladness, for all antinomies are solved, and all bliss is secured in the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Perhaps the most comprehensive doctrinal conception is that expressed by the term reconciliation. This word contains the sum of Christian doctrine (Rom. 11^{15} $5^{10.\ 11}$, 2 Cor. $5^{18.\ 19.\ 20}$). It assumes the existence of a state of enmity between man and God, the result of persistent disobedience or of the universality of sin. It implies the removal of that enmity and the establishment of peace with God. It contains the promise and potency of a new life of holiness and bliss. The Christian revelation is in brief "the reconciliation," and the work of Christ is exhaustively described in the words, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing unto them their trespasses." The apostolic message is the "word of reconciliation." A subsidiary question is here raised, whether in his primary view of the antagonisms that are thus overcome Paul was influenced by a dualism of pagan philosophy. Were his conceptions of human depravity, of man's alienation from God, and of the antagonisms of flesh and spirit a consequence of that mode of thought which made matter the abode or the condition of evil? Such a hypothesis is so improbable that only on the grounds of proved

necessity can it be entertained. To deny that Paul was reared as a strict Pharisee is to deny all certainty of knowledge. But the background and the framework of Paul's theology already existed in the rabbinical scheme of thought. It contained a consciousness of sin far more real than is found in Greece, but by no means the theories of the corruption of matter and of the pollution of the body of flesh. Nor can such doctrines, except by misinterpretation, be found in Paul. He rejoices in life and in the greatness of its possibilities. The flesh is to him no mass of corruption, but a convenient name for human nature, which he variously contemplates in its weakness and innocence, in its sorrow and sin. No theories of essential uncleanness, no dark and gloomy pessimism belong to this active apostle, but a large-minded humanity. Sin indeed entered into the world and spread over the human race. But the world was created good ; and its visible fruitfulness and beauty are a witness to the goodness of its Creator (Rom. 1^{20}). Paul's mode of thought is strictly related to the actualities of life as these are illuminated by the Scriptures and the learning of his tribe. Only in keenness and intensity does he differ from the pupils that sat with him at the feet of Gamaliel. But it may be true that in later Epistles there is a closer approximation to ideas of other lands.

The term καταλλαγή belongs only to Paul. It is true that a derivative word (ἀποκ . . .) is to be found in Ephesians, where it is related not so much to hostility as to separation, and where the recon-

ciliation has a double effectiveness in opening up access to God and in uniting Jew and Gentile. It is manifest that there we are in a new region of ideas, the religious effect being incomparably less profound. And again in Colossians we have the term of Ephesians in an attempt to restate the doctrine of Paul. In Ephesians this reconciliation is set forth as the work of Christ; but in Paul and again in Colossians it is announced as the doing of God, though mediated (as all things are) through Christ. This reconciliation is twofold, inasmuch as it implies the wrath of God, and the enmity of man. But the initiative is God's, by whom the basis of redemption is laid. And from God goes forth the message of peace, calling on man to be reconciled to God.

This reconciliation rests on expiation. The terms regarding sin and law and guilt are not rhetorical. The law pertains to God, and carries in it a curse. The doctrine of a merciful God who forgives the returning penitent is no part of the thought of Paul. To him, as to his race, sin is a thing that must be atoned for if its full consequences are not to be borne. And man escapes only because Christ bore the curse of the law (Gal. 3^{13}), having been made sin for us that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him (2 Cor. 5^{21}). There are points of difference as to the exact meaning of ἱλαστήριον (Rom. 3^{25}) and its connection with or divergence from the kindred texts (1 John 2^{2} 4^{10}, Heb. 2^{17}). The term is probably used adjectivally, as expressive of the general idea. But it is certain that an atoning death is implied. Christ, the federal

Representative, suffers for His people. Vicarious suffering is a principle of which the world is full. It may be traced in personal and in national history. In the teaching of the scribes it extended to the things of God. Thus it could meet the demands of the Divine law. And if a Divine person suffered for a race, His life might be sufficiently precious to be efficacious for all. Apart from rabbinical conceptions, two special arguments might have led Paul to this doctrine. One was prophecy; for as soon as it was realised that Jesus was the Messiah, and that the Messiah was the Servant of Jehovah, pictured at length in Deutero-Isaiah, the whole thing stood revealed in the great vision of Isaiah 53, and in the texts that spoke of Jehovah as bearing the afflictions of His people. And secondly, there was the testimony of Christ when He founded the new feast and the New Covenant in His blood. The conception of Christ as the Paschal Lamb, or, in Paul's words, as our Passover, implied atonement for the sins of the world. Christ's life or death had such significance because of His exalted Being, as the Son of God and Maker of worlds. But Paul, to realise the representative and federal character of the Redeemer, works out the conception in other aspects. He sees Jesus as the Archetypal Man in whose eternal Image man was originally created. He is the Lord from heaven (1 Cor. 15^{47}). And inasmuch as Christ's people are those who through faith of His name have entered into fellowship with His Death and Resurrection, He is also conceived as a second or last Adam, the First-born of a new

creation, the federal Head of a new society, the life-giving Spirit in whom a new spiritual community is constituted. As, therefore, the sin of Adam had a significance for the whole human race born after the flesh, so the righteousness of Christ has an equally extensive significance for all who are born after the Spirit. And thus the supreme act of obedience, the Death on the Cross, is in its atoning efficacy federal, representative, vicarious.

These high doctrines permeate Paul's Epistles and, except in John and partially in Colossians, cannot be said to be explicit anywhere else. In Hebrews and in Ephesians Christ is the Priest rather than the Victim, though it is Himself He offers, and as a willing sacrifice. In these the result is not so much the cancelling of guilt as the making of a way of access to God. And the effect is mainly ethical and subjective, in the removal of the burden and consciousness of guilt, and in the enablement of men to live unto righteousness. Doctrines of substitution and expiation are in the other groups, to say the least, doubtful. In Paul an intenser consciousness of sin and guilt and condemnation has led to a deeper doctrine of deliverance.

The same subject is approached from another point of view, indicated by the phrase "the righteousness of God." This is perhaps the most characteristic expression of Paul. It occurs in the same sense nowhere else. But it is so prominent in Rom. 1–8 that it may be styled the main theme of the Epistle. The doctrine presents itself in two forms, corresponding respectively to the guilt and

the power of sin. They are handled successively through these eight great chapters. The phrase takes us back to the doctrine of the law. Paul was a scribe learned therein, and the effects of his legal education are seen in whatever he handles. Nor as a religious man can he escape from the thought of this dominating power, which in its authority and requirements is absolute, and towards the fulfilment of which his best efforts are vain. The ordinary Jew was taught that in return for obedience he had the assurance of life. But to the religious mind this perfect obedience was glorified as a thing partaking of heavenly excellence; an ideal of perfection which, humanly speaking, was unattainable, but which nevertheless was a hope of the pious, cherished in view of the coming Messianic time. Paul must have known the expectation in that form. He knew it also as a problem of actual life. He knew the contradictions of reality and hope. But a key to the solution was found in the Crucifixion of the Son of God. A new world was now opened to his soul, and what was impossible to earthly effort was felt to be attainable by faith. In an unexpected way this aspect of the Messianic hope was realised.

The keynote of the great Epistle (Rom. 1^{17}) announces that in the Gospel the righteousness of God is unveiled. It is thereby described as something that has been historically manifested and that also possesses a saving power for men. Again, in the opening of 1 Corinthians, in a parallel passage where the saving efficacy of the Gospel is

again announced, Christ (it is said) is made unto us righteousness (1^{30}). Through Him and through fellowship with Him this righteousness can be attained by man. As we follow the argument in Romans we find more particularly that the righteousness is exhibited in the Death of Christ ($3^{21.\ 22.\ 26}$). In this event are combined God's justice and salvation, His righteousness in the spheres of holiness and redeeming love (3^{26}). In it are explained His forbearance in the past, when the Divine righteousness seemed in abeyance, and His action in the present, when He proves Himself at once just and the justifier of the faithful. So far it is blended with the doctrine of propitiation as effected by the blood of the righteous Son of God. And it finds its own designation in the phrase "justification by faith." Christ was delivered up for our trespasses and was raised for our justification.

But justification by faith, which some might call the most distinctive doctrine of Paul, gives us only one side of the shield. The other is no less vital. The believer is in the new service of righteousness, striving towards holiness or complete sanctification. He is united in mystic fellowship with Christ. In Christ's death he died, in Christ's life he lives. He is dead unto sin, but alive unto God. Righteousness is the sphere of his new existence. The end of Christ's work is that the righteous requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us (8^{4}), or, as it is otherwise put, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him (2 Cor. 5^{21}). Here we are on the ground of newness of life, otherwise handled as

the inworking of the Spirit. The two sides are exhibited successively. But they are not to be regarded as entirely separate. Doctrine and ethics are in Paul one thing; for the new life or "new creation" is everything. It is natural that in a detailed and systematic statement of the faith (such as we have in Romans and nowhere else) various aspects should be handled separately, and thus through successive lines of argument the truth should be fully unfolded. In Galatians, where it is said we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness (5^5); or in Philippians, where the righteousness which is from God by faith (3^9) is placed high above the righteousness which has observed the prescriptions of the law, it is open to discussion whether a forensic or a spiritual aspect is in view, or rather whether the former has not been lost sight of in the fuller blaze of a Divine regeneration. The one aspect may be described as Christ for us and unto us; the other as Christ with us and in us. But in either case it is Christ. He is made unto us righteousness. And whether the conception be legal or spiritual, the righteousness is in its source objective, a thing derived from God, an essential part of the Messianic salvation granted unto men.

Now in substance this may not differ from other N.T. teaching, but in form it does. This objective use of righteousness is peculiar to Paul. It may be a usage of the O.T., of Deutero-Isaiah in particular, but it is not elsewhere in the N.T. In Ephesians or the Pastorals, in Matthew or in James, the term is used only in its normal ethical sense. The virtue is of

earthly, not heavenly, origin. It is neither imputed nor imparted, but simply attained.

Once more, while we find in Paul the two specific doctrines of expiation and justification, we find these embraced in the more general ideas of reconciliation and redemption. We began with the statement of reconciliation as more distinctively Pauline, and as inclusive of his conception of justification. But the conception of redemption is put by the apostle in the foreground as the general effect of the expiation or propitiation (Rom. 3^{24}). And here also Paul is definite and distinctive. He does not use λυτρόω, the term of the second and fourth groups (Luke 24^{31}, Tit. 2^{14}, 1 Pet. 1^{18}, cf. Heb. 9^{12})—a term both of the Septuagint and the Greeks; nor its derivatives, λύτρον, ἀντιλύτρον, λύτρωσις. He avoids the language of priestly ritual as one brought up in other habits of thought. But he employs the plain language of the market-place: ἀγοράζω, procure by purchase (1 Cor. 6^{20} 7^{23}), or more widely ἐξαγοράζω (Gal. 3^{13} 4^{5}); and he adds in the one Epistle "with a price," in the other "from the curse of the law," to make the reality of the propitiation and the definiteness of the deliverance more unmistakable. It is true that when he has to use a substantive he finds no available derivative from ἀγοράζω, and falls back on the general term ἀπολύτρωσις. And this term he has to use in a twofold sense: in Rom. 3^{24} (as in Eph. 1^{7}, Col. 1^{14}, Heb. 9^{15}) of deliverance from sin, and in 8^{23} and perhaps 1 Cor. 1^{30} (as in Eph. 1^{14} 4^{30}) of the final deliverance from conditions of mortality. This term therefore shares,

with σωτηρία, the two main meanings of deliverance from the guilt of sin and of emancipation from the frailty of the body. The better meaning is of course associated with the risen Christ and with the expectation of His coming. The former takes us back to the death of Christ. And while in the second group the result is attributed to sacrificial blood, in Paul it is associated with "a price," even an expiatory death.

The doctrine of Paul is distinctive in its conception of redemption as from the "curse of the law" (Gal. 3^{13}). With the law and its curse no other writer of the N.T. continues to concern himself. But it is a strange development to find in the most Pauline of the later Epistles that the redemption is from the power of demons (Col. 2^{15}). Another peculiarity of Pauline expression—due partly to the doctrinal conception of Christ as the federal Head and partly to the mystical conception of union or fellowship—is the identification of the Christian with Christ in death and resurrection (Rom. 6, 7). If one died for all, then all died. And this is to Paul not a mere figure of speech, but a fundamental fact of the spiritual situation. It is a death that involves discharge from the law (Rom. 7^{6}), and therefore freedom from condemnation. And it is a death to sin (6^{2}), so as to involve freedom from its baleful power. This is a mode of thought that is sufficient to differentiate Paul. Only once in the later Epistles — but here Colossians asserts its kinship — do we find the phrase "ye died" (Col. 3^{3}).

Distinctive also of Paul is the use of forensic language. The term redemption belongs largely to popular language, and expresses a civil or political as much as a legal idea. Yet Paul's redemption from "the curse of the law" has a forensic look. Adoption is also a mixed term. In Paul it occurs thrice, in what might be reckoned a legal and moral and an eschatological sense respectively (Gal. 4^5, Rom. $8^{15.\ 23}$); and once more as descriptive of the ratification of the choice of a covenant people (9^5). In the rest of the New Testament there is a solitary instance where perhaps a Pauline expression is chosen to denote a moral or spiritual idea (Eph. 1^5, cf. in the same group Heb. 2^{10} 12^7, Matt. 5^9, 2 Cor. 6^{18}). Or otherwise: Gal. 4^6 and Rom. 8^{15} describe the moral condition which is the immediate accompaniment of the objective or forensic fact stated in Gal. 4^5. The other two cases (Rom. 9^5 8^{23}) refer to objective fact of supreme significance; the beginning of a national history and the goal of final anticipation. On the other hand, the reference in Ephesians is to the admission into the heavenly kingdom conceived only as an eternal purpose. But if redemption and adoption are partially, justification is wholly, a forensic idea. And in the New Testament it is exclusively Pauline. So also is its opposite, condemnation. And it is remarkable that even the word λογίζομαι (reckon or account), which in the Pauline group occurs over twenty times, is not found in the other Epistles or parts associated with Paul's name, except once in those closing verses of 2 Timothy which bear other

traces of the very words of Paul. This forensic mode of thought may have been modified by experiences of the empire; but fundamentally it was a permanent result of Pharisaic education. The scribes and rabbis studied the law, and studied it legally; and in legal categories their thoughts were placed. Therefore, when this pupil of Gamaliel received the molten gold of Christian revelation, he received it into legal moulds.

And contrariwise, as the forensic conception is natural to Paul, so the idea of forgiveness is entirely foreign. A judge does not forgive. The parable of the Prodigal Son could not have been admitted into Paul's gospel unless first a deep foundation was laid. To him the guilt of sin was infinite, and mere condonation was impossible. In our second group sin is remitted or, it may be, condoned (Eph. 4^{32}) on account of Christ's sacrifice. In Paul it is expiated. And in this awful doctrine Paul stands alone.

One word more. It is in accordance with this stern conception of things that Paul glories in the Cross. In the other Epistles the verb does not occur, and the noun rarely (Eph. 2^{16}, Heb. 12^{2}, and twice in the more Pauline Colossians). But to Paul's transfigured mind this stumbling-block of shame was the highest theme of pride. The Cross gathered into a unity that prophetic record of the sufferings of the Messiah (Isa. 53). It exhibited before the world God's redemption (Gal. 3^{1}). It revealed sin and grace. It revolutionised moral ideals.

As subsidiary to the theme of Christ's saving work we briefly note some points of general theology. The double purpose is kept in view of indicating what Paul taught and wherein in form he is individual and distinctive. First let us note, as most closely allied to soteriology, some conceptions regarding the Person of Christ.

Christ was pre-existent, and the instrumental cause of creation (1 Cor. 8^{6}). Thus before the worlds He was the companion of God. In this state of glory He was "in the form of God." This is probably not intended to imply full equality with God (Phil. 2^{6}). There is one God the Father, of whom and through whom and unto whom are all things (Rom. 11^{36}). But beside Him is one Lord, through whom also are all things, and who may be styled "God blessed for ever" (Rom. 9^{5}). This name, while to Paul it was associated with the conception of Jehovah, is yet used with distinct reference to lower conceptions among the Greeks. The Corinthians had heard of gods many and lords many; of beings perhaps that stood apart from, and that concerned themselves with, the affairs of our world. Paul, brushing aside these vague imaginations, announces the one supreme God (not Σεῦς but ὁ Θεός ὁ πατήρ), and the one supreme Lord to whom every power in our universe is subject. Now in this conception there is nothing that is non-Palestinian. Only in John and in Colossians do we come in contact with later Alexandrian conceptions. In Hebrews the language is derived from the Book of Wisdom. But in Paul the conception is at once

original and in accordance with ideas that belong generally to the history and literature of his race. The conception in Prov. 8 is an illustration; but the most striking passage is in the Book of Enoch. It may be assumed that the existence of a second hypostasis in the Godhead was a vague but general belief which now in those who accepted Christ as a Divine Person, the Son of God, crystallised itself into a definite living faith.

It is open to question whether Paul means this eternal Lord to be considered as, in His pre-existence, Man (1 Cor. 15^{47}). If so He is the prototype and archetype in whose image man was originally created, into whose image, in a fuller sense, man regenerate will ultimately be transformed.

The entrance into human life was a kenosis (2 Cor. 8^{9}, Phil. 2^{6}). This is a point of doctrine on which little is said. Paul's view is apparently explained away in Col. 1^{19}, John $1^{14.\ 18}$. It is notable that the earthly life of Christ enters very slightly into the thought of Paul. He is concerned with his Davidic descent and true humanity; but both theology and ethics are based on the Death and Resurrection. In the second group Christ is variously an example, in suffering, in obedience, in patience, in meekness, in guilelessness, in fulfilling righteousness and in doing good. No such thoughts belong to Paul. The great example of humility and self-sacrifice or unselfishness consisted in laying aside the form and splendour of God. One supreme point, however, is asserted—Christ "knew no sin"

(2 Cor. 5^{21}). This is stated on account of its theological importance.

The Resurrection is emphasised as a proof of Sonship (Rom. 1^{4}, Gal. 1^{1}, Phil. 2^{11}, Acts 13^{33}). It is a manifestation thereof in power (cf. also fourth group, Acts 2^{36} 13^{33}, 1 Tim. 3^{16}). On the other hand, Eph. 1^{6} (and probably Col. 1^{13}) seem to refer to the baptismal voice.

As risen, Christ is the *πρωτότοκος*, not merely as the first among many brethren (cf. *ἀπαρχη*, 1 Cor. 15^{20}), but (as the term connoted) as the prince or head or leader thereof. (In Colossians the term is used both in this Pauline application and in the Alexandrian sense as a title of the pre-existent Logos.) In Hebrews it is used in this latter sense (1^{6}), and also of the church of the firstborn (12^{23}); not specially of Christ as risen.

As risen and as *πρωτότοκος* He is the second or last Adam, the new Head of a new spiritual race. From Him all derive their life, and in Him all are gathered up. He is the federal Representative and Lord.

This risen Christ was seen by Paul (1 Cor. 9^{1} 15^{8}), a luminous Figure with which to hold converse, and in whose face he beheld the glory of God. This Christ is the image of God (2 Cor. 4^{4}). The vision of Him is the knowledge of God (4^{6}), ; in Him is beheld the glory of Jehovah (3^{18}), and His is the image unto which the redeemed are to be conformed (Rom. 8^{29}).

This risen Christ is spiritual (15^{46}). He bears no longer the old body of flesh, but a transformed

existence. He is spirit; and He is the Spirit—for the Holy Ghost working among men is no other than Christ (2 Cor. 3^{17}, Rom. $8^{10.11}$). And He is not only living but life giving (1 Cor. 15^{45}), the source of the spiritual life of men.

Christ is exalted to the right hand of God, and has obtained the "name above every name" (this name seems to be Lord, and not, as in the same connection in Heb. $1^{2.3}$, Son). It involves lordship over all being in heaven or in earth or underground. This doctrine is stated only in the last of the Epistles (Phil. 2^{9-11}), and is therefore not an essential part of Paulinism. It belongs to the second and third groups, where in particular it expresses the dominion of Christ over all superhuman spiritual entities. This is a case where we see Paul extending his system to meet new problems. Questions of principalities and demons were arising to vex the growing Church. The doctrine of the exaltation of Christ to the right hand—the place of honour—in heaven was held from the first; and Paul's statement implies the evangelic tradition. The one point of *Session* at the right hand is not given in Paul. In the vision of Stephen the Son of man was *standing*.

The exalted Christ is an Intercessor (Rom. 8^{34}, cf. vers. 26–27 as another proof that Christ and the Spirit are one). This priestly function (so Heb. 7^{25} 9^{24}) belongs to Him as the federal Head and Representative of His people. It is one of the ways in which He continues the good work begun. Christ prays with and within His people, but

also as their Advocate at the throne of grace on high.

The Church teaches the doctrines of the Trinity and of the consubstantiality of Christ and God. All things were not revealed to Paul. But he struck the keynote of Christian theology by exalting Christ above all creation. In the second group there is—in appearance—a closer approximation to the doctrines of the Creeds. But the language is rhetorical, and in reality we do not meet the same exalted conceptions until we find them reproduced and extended in Colossians and John. Paul could not conceive of Christ as absolute God. The intensity of affection that he felt for "Christ Jesus my Lord" was directed not to the Supreme Being (towards whom he would feel more awe), but to the heavenly Man who was his self-sacrificing Redeemer. All things are of God, whose work of creation and redemption Christ has carried through. All the perfections of God are in Christ, who to us manifests the Divine. All the love of God is embodied and revealed in Christ. Ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's. The Head of every man is Christ, and the Head of Christ is God (1 Cor. 3^{23} 11^{3}).

On the doctrine of God the apostle has not enlarged, though there are indications that he frequently inculcated the principles of natural religion (Rom. 1, 2, Acts 14^{15-17} $17^{24.\ 30}$). The most striking thing in his conception of the Divine character is a sort of antinomy between the conception of a righteous Judge, which is the basis of his theology, and the knowledge of a gracious Father, which is

equally the basis of his religious life. These conceptions of a just God and a Saviour were of course harmonised in the work of Christ. Whether subjectively the apostle was equally conscious of perfect harmony it is not so easy to say. The doctrine of a righteous judgment was certainly never laid aside, though it may have been modified by ideas either of the Divine goodness which through long patience invited men to repentance or of the Divine wisdom which disposed the events of history so as to conduce most effectively to the fulfilment of the ultimate purpose. He was conscious that in God's government there was a knowledge or a wisdom to man unsearchable, and that over all things goodness reigned.

Of God his general name is "the Father" (Rom. 6^4, 1 Cor. 8^5), but in addressing fellow-Christians and invoking benedictions "the Father" becomes "our Father." This may accord with the usage in the words of Christ, but it is certainly due to the consciousness of adoption. A voice within cries, Abba! It is the Spirit of the Son creating the consciousness that He too is a child of God. And this also is distinctive of Paul. The words, indeed, are repeated in Ephesians and Colossians; but they are not natural to the second group, and in the Pastoral group the pronoun is carefully excluded. It is remarkable, indeed, that the writer who starts from the sternest conception of the rigid justice of God is the chief exponent of the riches of God's grace. But herein is simply an illustration of the depth of Paul's nature and of the completeness of

the transformation he underwent. He has become keenly conscious of personal relationships with God, who is "my God" and by whose grace "I am what I am." It is vain to expound in detail the gifts or calling of Him of whom "are all things"; who is the Creator of life and the Controller of history, who has given the word of truth and the light of revelation and the messages of grace. But it is of His goodness that the apostle has learned to think most. He knows Him as the "Father of mercies and the God of all comfort." And thus in the secondary sense also of preserver and provider, of guardian and comforter and friend, He is "our Father." To Paul also is due the description "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. 1^3). These words teach the Divine nature of Christ. But they also emphasise the fact that the Christian salvation is due to God and to God's love. Everywhere and in all things God is present in the fulness of His grace. "He spared not His own Son, but freely delivered Him up for us all." His bounty is unrestricted. Nothing can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord (Rom. $8^{32, 39}$).

Next let us look briefly at the doctrine of the Spirit. Here as much as anywhere do we find evidence of the creative mind of Paul. Note first the frequency of the term. In the five Epistles it occurs about sixty times. In the five Thessalonian and Pastoral Epistles there are perhaps seven occurrences, and the proportion is not greater in Hebrews, 1 Peter (3), or Colossians (1). Only in

Ephesians, which is a Pauline manifesto, is the usage of Paul fairly reproduced. Again of the sixty in Paul, only six contain the epithet "Holy," and of these there may be cases not due to himself. Elsewhere, in half the instances this epithet is used. When we examine more closely, the differences become not less striking. Broadly, in Paul as a rule, and rarely elsewhere, the Spirit is associated with the moral life and upward aspirations of men. The non-Pauline view regards the Spirit as an objective influence coming from without, resting upon the believer or the Church (as in 1 Pet. 4^{13}), and filling the heart emotionally so as to produce ecstatic utterance, or joyous excitement, or a sense of power (Eph. 3^{17} 5^{18}, Heb. 2^4 6^4, 1 Thess. $1^{5.6}$, Acts often). A more special usage regards the Spirit as the organ of inspiration. This applies to the O.T. Scriptures (Heb. $3^{7.10.15.}$ 9^8), to apostolic preaching (1 Pet. 1^{12}, 1 Thess. 1^5), and to the apocalyptic messages delivered to the Church by its recognised prophets (1 Tim. 4^1). The work of the Spirit is therefore to communicate power or to give intellectual guidance. The same general mode of thought belongs to John, and also to Paul; but in Paul the main theme is the union of the Divine Spirit with the human, and the results thereof in thought and feeling and life. It is true that in the second group occurs a notable phrase—"sanctification of the Spirit," where, however, the probable meaning is external consecration, and where, in any case, the language seems derived from Paul (1 Cor. 5^{11}). There are also in the Pastorals two

examples of an approach to Pauline language, 2 Tim. 1^{14}, which is Pauline only in appearance, and Tit. 3^{5}, which corresponds rather to the Johannine regeneration.

In Paul the Spirit is the Spirit of God communicating to man an inward Divine power, or it is the Spirit of Christ, or Christ Himself, with whom the believer possesses a mystic fellowship. This Spirit sent forth by God creates in the heart the consciousness of adoption, a faint realisation of that filial relationship, which was the permanent consciousness of Jesus (Gal. 4^{6}, Rom. 8^{16}). It produces the sense of Divine liberty, or freedom of access and knowledge with regard to God (2 Cor. 3^{17}), and at the same time a heavenly love which is creative of a new type of character (Rom. 5^{5}). In the region of spiritual knowledge it is no less active and effective, teaching truths and illuminating mysteries beyond the scope of the natural man. For the Spirit can search the mysteries of God, and reveal them unto men (1 Cor. 2). Thus acting variously on various minds it produces the manifold gifts by which the Church is edified (1 Cor. 12). That the gifts of utterance and prophecy were from the Holy Spirit, or were the mark of the presence of the Spirit, all Christians believed. But it was the work of Paul to broaden this apprehension, to reduce the relative importance assigned to unusual manifestations, to show that the same Spirit operated, and to greater benefit, in calm spiritual discernment and in every moral excellence (1 Cor. 13. 14). These chapters

in 1 Corinthians (12. 14) are the authoritative statement for the regulation of Church worship and life. And if, in the intervening chapter on Charity, reference to the Spirit is wanting, let it be remembered that the apostle is describing the love which is "shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Spirit which is given unto us." Apart from these three chapters, the main burden of Paul's teaching on the subject is to be found in his exhortations to the individual on life, walk, and fruitfulness in the Spirit.

Life in the Spirit—this has the same double aspect as union with Christ—life in the Spirit, and the Spirit in life. Thus the Spirit dwells in the mortal body (Rom. 8^{11}), making it what is called a Temple of God (1 Cor. 6^{19}). This thought is to be widely differentiated from the parallel idea in Ephesians of a community which is a holy temple, a habitation of God in the Spirit ($2^{21.\ 22}$). There the idea is of a consecrated people; but in Paul the reference is to the personal individual life of the Christian. The Spirit dwells within, and as a consequence the possessed is a possessor; he dwells in the Spirit, in a new world of thought and emotion, of hope and aspiration, of ideals and endeavours. The natural life has sunk, but a new life is found in which the believer is at once mastered and free, and in which while he walks he "is led." He sows to the Spirit, and reaps therefrom; and the result is the manifold fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5^{16-25} 6^{8}).

Pertaining to this doctrine both in Romans and in

Galatians is the statement of the struggle of flesh and spirit. These words, by whatsoever suggested, are to be understood in a popular sense. The flesh is humanity in its ordinarily natural conditions. Between this natural life of instinct and impulse, and the higher ideal life of reason and mind, there is a contradiction of which in all ages men have been conscious: *meliora proboque, deteriora sequor.* It was Paul's way to think antithetically, and he contrasts the outward and the inward man; the members and the mind, the flesh and the spirit. And it is natural that when he is contemplating man on the ideal side, and in immediate relation to God, he should use by preference the term "spirit." And accordingly the war of flesh and spirit is his designation of the struggle that he knows to exist between the lower and the higher elements in man. But it adds to the difficulty of interpretation that the same term "spirit" is used of what is human and of what is Divine. And this difficulty, of which the apostle would have been unconscious, arises out of an oriental mode of thought. The human spirit may be deemed a breath or effluence of the great or supreme Spirit, which for a time has found a separate existence, but must endure a troubled course of being until it finds reunion with its source and goal. To Paul this human spirit is far other that a breath. He knows it as an eternal personality for whom there is in store an individual glorified life in the hereafter. And again, his personal experiences of contact with the risen Christ and of continuous aspiration must have imparted definite-

ness to his conceptions. Accordingly he clearly distinguishes the human from the Divine Spirit (Rom 8^{16}), and writes of their interaction or co-operation ($8^{9.\ 10.\ 26}$). He therefore conceives of the human spirit as suffused and energised or enlightened by the indwelling Spirit. And that indwelling Spirit, which can quicken and immortalise the body which it inhabits, is sometimes conceived in the fulness of personality, as in the work of intercession (8^{26}), and sometimes as if it were subordinate to the human spirit, bringing help but constituting only the earnest or first-fruits of what is to be possessed in fulness in the future; things difficult logically and theologically, but intelligible enough as expressions for varying degrees and aspects of the Divine activity and power.

We see, therefore, in this subject of the Spirit that with an unusual strength of religious consciousness and with the clear courage of spiritual vision Paul advances where other apostolic teachers are not prone to follow. He writes as one to whose spirit the Divine Spirit has revealed eternal mysteries, and who is also conscious of a new moral life created by the union and co-operation of his soul with God. And here let us note also (though it pertains to psychology) the diversity in the use of language. To Paul spirit is the normal name of our higher nature, and soul (Phil. 1^{27} being adverbial) is not so used at all. But in the second group spirit is of rare occurrence, and soul in this sense is frequent (1 Pet. $1^{9.\ 22}$ $2^{11.\ 25}$, Heb. 6^{19} 12^{3} 13^{17}, Matt. 10^{28} 11^{29}). In 1 Peter the warfare

of flesh and spirit is changed into flesh and soul. In Matthew soul and body are supplementary, as in our ordinary speech. It is true that in the second group spirit is used two or three times in a new sense as something different from soul and deeper (1 Thess. 5^{23}, Heb. 4^{12}, cf. Eph. 4^{23}), some subtle derivation or modification thereof. But the broader usage, in which Paul stands virtually alone, has given this word its permanent place in the language of the Christian world.

Akin to this is the subject of supernatural agencies. In Paul there is no elaborate angelology or demonology. He of course believed in angels, and speaks of the Old Covenant as given through them (Gal. 3^{19}). It is true also that in the peroration of Rom. 8 the terms "principalities," "powers," are included along with six others of a more purely abstract description; and perhaps the ἐπουρανίων of Phil. 2^{10} includes angelic hierarchies. But even so the conception of these superhuman beings is a quiescent opinion, and does not enter into the apostle's scheme of thought. Quite different is the case in all the Epistles of the second group (Eph. 1. 6, Heb. 1. 2, 1 Pet. 3), where principalities are introduced into the moral struggles of life (Eph. 6), and where Christ's exaltation is set forth mainly with reference to them.

Again, the Prince of evil is nowhere styled διάβολος or ὁ πονηρός, both of which names are given in the second group, On the other hand, Satan, as a mean deceiver and as an enemy of the work of Christ, has a large place in the Corinthian

Epistles (1 Cor. 7^5, 2 Cor. 2^{11} 11^{14} 12^7) apart from the disciplinary functions with which his name is associated (1 Cor. 5^5); and from the Epistles of the second group (excepting one apocalyptic passage, 2 Thess. 2^9) he is altogether excluded. Again, we may compare in Paul "the god of this world," deceiving and blinding men (2 Cor. 4^4) with the "Prince of the power of the air" (in Eph. 2^2), working sin in the disobedient. In Paul the emphasis is on deception; in Ephesians, on the general conception of evil. And this corresponds with other descriptions of the moral conflicts of life. In Ephesians we are encompassed with world-rulers of this darkness, with spiritual hosts that range themselves under the banner of the Evil One. But Paul conjures up no unseen enemy. He describes no wrestling with principalities and no fiery darts. Here at least he is at one with James. And perhaps the point illustrates the contrast between the pure Hebraic and the more eclectic types. In any case it is the struggle of flesh and spirit, which strive in the contrariety of natural enmity. The source of evil is in man.

Lastly, let us glance at the subject of the destiny of the redeemed. Here in definiteness and boldness and grandeur Paul transcends the others. In the second group the term "salvation" is specially used of the change of condition that takes place after death or at the coming of the Lord—the entrance into the eternal inheritance. On this inheritance and its imperishable character the emphasis is thrown. Paul puts the emphasis on

the inheritor; and while he does not equal the other in gorgeous language, he presents the more dazzling picture of a frail mortal man transformed into a luminous and immortal son of God. Paul *saw* the risen Christ. From that assurance he derived his doctrine; from that memory he developed his conceptions of the life of the future. Here as elsewhere, and here more than elsewhere, we have the gospel of the Resurrection. Not where Christ is, but what Christ is, is his cardinal consideration. Of the future kingdom he has little to say except that nothing unclean enters (Gal. 5^{21}), and that participation in it is being "with Christ" (Phil. 1^{21}). But its inauguration is the "apocalypse of the sons of God" (Rom. 8^{19}). The cardinal fact is that adoption which is the "redemption of the body." The redemption means an existence, not bodiless but hypostatic, spiritualised. And for further description it is exhausted in the words "like Christ."

Two statements, then, are made regarding the future. First, the redeemed are sons; that is to say, they partake of an angelic nature of brightness and divineness. They are clothed with life, immortality, incorruption. Secondarily, they are transformed into the image of Christ. This point is variously and explicitly asserted. In 1 Cor. 15^{49} the Christian is to bear the image of the heavenly —Christ being the man from heaven. In Rom. 8^{29} he is "predestined to be conformed to the image" of God's son. In Phil. 3^{21} the coming Saviour will transform this body into the "likeness of the body

of His glory." Now, these thoughts of transformation and sonship are precisely the same; and therefore passages dealing with adoption, such as Gal. 3^{26} $4^{5.7}$, Rom. 8^{14-23}, as well as 2 Cor. 2^{18} 5^{1-4}, are to be studied in the same connection. Christ was the son of God in His earthly life; but the manifestation thereof took place (as Paul judged) on His resurrection. And the parallelism holds. As the manifested Son He was freed from earthly limitations and clothed with heavenly splendour. And the "many brethren" of whom He is the elder will experience the same liberation and enter into the same glory.

It is natural to a mystic seer to conceive this transformation not only as a sudden cataclysm transcending the ordinary processes of life, but also as a gradual, scarcely cognisable, evolution, silently, ceaselessly advancing. "We all beholding the glory of the Lord are changed into the same image" (2 Cor. 3^{18}). This is by no means a purely ethical idea. So further on he adds, "Our outward man is decaying, yet our inward man is renewed day by day" (2 Cor. 4^{16}). Behind these words lies a philosophic interpretation of life. The apostle sees the links with time all loosening, the organs of sense decaying, the faculties of the outward man fading or diminishing. But he is conscious of inward powers still strengthening, of an expansiveness and freshness of soul that indicate a growing adaptation to a new and more spiritual sphere of being. The yearnings of a Divine unrest confirm this judgment. He longs to be delivered from

the weariness of mortality and to be clothed upon with the heavenly habitation (1 Cor. 15, 2 Cor. 5, Rom. 8). And the putting on of Christ (Gal. 3^{27}) is to the apostle a transcendental act, parallel to the reception of the "earnest of the Spirit," containing the potentiality of the ultimate transformation. This final result includes the possession of a heavenly body. It is, indeed, variously described as the redemption or the transfiguration of this body, but it is also reckoned a new body and described as a house from heaven (2 Cor. 5^{2}). And again, it is both gradual and instantaneous (1 Cor. 15^{52}). The term which describes its excellence or blessedness is "glory." As Christ shared the glory of the Father, so shall we be participators in His glory (Rom. $8^{17.\ 18.\ 21}$, 1 Cor. 15^{43}, 2 Cor. 3^{18} 4^{17}, Phil. 3^{21}). And again, the term "image" links Christ with God, and man with Christ, and suggests the realisation in the redeemed of the original purpose of creation. The full realisation of these expectations, the final accomplishment of God's purposes, constitutes the "one far-off Divine event to which the whole creation moves." But even now in this wayward world, and amid mortal weakness, Paul sees it begun. The spirit of adoption is to him the pledge of immortal sonship; the earnest of the Spirit (2 Cor. 1^{22} 5^{5}, Rom. 8^{23}) is the assurance of ultimate fulness; the Spirit of God who called forth Christ from the dead is able to quicken the mortal bodies of His people. Thus the life of the present passes into the future, and

one continuity of existence embraces earth and heaven.

Throughout this chapter we have set forth a body of thought homogeneous, distinctive, unique. It is the common Christianity in a form that stands by itself; Paul's gospel of Christ. At no point does it mingle with other interpretations of Christ. On any and every doctrine we assert distinctness of conception and expression, the individuality of living and constructive genius. And of the soteriology, with its forensic and vicarious elements, we found that it was a system of rabbinical Christianity lifted up into a higher region of grace and spirit. But the energising power of Paul's Christianity came from the vision of Christ; and to this are due his doctrines of the Spirit and of the spiritual body of the future. Here also, and here most of all, Paul is unique. His doctrine expresses no vague idea of immortality or of bliss in a paradise or island of the blest which but idealises the beauty and the bounty of our earth. Not happiness but heavenly righteousness is the burden of his mind, and a knowledge of that God whose wisdom is unsearchable, but whose love or grace is more wonderful still. Therefore he dreams not of gardens of delight, but of personality and spiritual power, of a glorified existence in fellowship with his Lord, an existence of enlarged and sanctified powers where, free from all weakness of the flesh, he can gaze into the face of God and know as he is known (1 Cor. 13^{12}). It is surely remarkable that, except in John, there

is no distinct trace in any subsequent writing of these great conceptions. In the second group the holiness of the inheritance, and in the Pastoral group the greatness of rewards are stated. Traces of the heavenliness of heaven we find in all (1 Pet. 1^4, 2 Thess. 1^5, Col. 1^{12}, 2 Tim. 4^8), but in none of these do we find ideas of growth and evolution and enlargement in harmony with conceptions of a world of absolute life and light and love. In his assurance of spiritually embodied life amid the depths of wisdom and knowledge and goodness, and in conditions of unimaginable glory, Paul lived on heights of contemplative vision where no colleague or disciple essayed to stand by his side.

2. *General*

1. Religion subjectively considered is a life of FAITH. Salvation being a Divine bestowal is not a thing of merit or attainment, but of reception and appropriation. It is a gift of grace to which the response is faith. This is true regarding both justification and sanctification. The saving righteousness is revealed from faith to faith (Rom. 1^{17}). The benefit of the propitiation is obtained through faith (3^{20} 5^1). The life of the just or justified is by faith (1^{17}). The life of spiritual renewal and power is in faith (Gal. 2^{20}). Through the Spirit by faith we wait for the hope of righteousness (Gal. 5^5). Of the whole sphere of Christian conduct it may be briefly said that we walk by

faith, not by sight (2 Cor. 5^{7}). Thus with clearness and energy Paul reconceives the place and power of faith. It supersedes works as grace supersedes law. It becomes the law or principle of spiritual life, the condition or power creative of noble conduct. It is not a virtue amongst other virtues, but the force behind them all.

The object of this faith is Jesus Christ (Rom. 3^{22}, Gal. 2^{16} 3^{22}), the Son of God (Gal. 2^{20}), the risen Lord (Rom. 10^{9}). This doctrine, which is also Johannine, is in some sense the universal Christian position; but as a matter of fact, many give prominence to faith in God, or in Christianity as a revelation of God. Paul's chief expression is "faith of Christ," and it indicates the intimate personal relationship which he feels towards his Lord. It is not faith in a philosophical system or a Divine order or an absolute ruler, but in a personal Redeemer. And it is not merely the faith grounded in Christ (ἐν) of the Pastorals, or towards Christ of Acts 20^{21} 24^{24} 26^{18}; but an immediate living apprehension of the person embraced. Later reflection may give to faith many forms and aspects, may bring it into relation with the entire invisible world, and may imagine it as belief, as trust, as devotion, as active obedience. In Paul we have the penetration of the first discoverer, the vivid and authoritative statement of a doctrine which disciples variously receive and only partially comprehend. One other thought is fundamental. It is not only a source of power; it also beautifies life, because it works through love (Gal. 5^{6}).

2. Ethics is to Paul no detached subject with some philosophical basis of its own, taught in a separate chair, with chapters of exhortation, lessons of prudence, glowing perorations of moral appeal. But through every page shine the aim, character, and spirit of a Divine life. Paul's ethics are evangelical; that is to say, they are summed up in Christ. He is the source, the standard, and the goal. The purpose of revelation is to effect righteousness, every aspect points to this end; and the new spiritual life is designed to accomplish what the Mosaic failed to bring about, the fulfilment in us of the righteous requirement of the law (Rom. 8^3). But if this is accomplished it is due to Christ, who is made unto us righteousness, sanctification, redemption. It is a doctrine of mystic union by which the personality of the individual is not only sheltered by his Lord, but is interfused by the Spirit of that Lord. Christ is formed and dwells within; the believer lives and walks in the Spirit. Paul is the one author of these watch-words: "Christ liveth in me"; "in Christ Jesus": striving to be "found in Him."

This transference of the Divine into human life produces an abrupt departure from all human codes. It is no longer a question of new virtues or of comparative merits or of improved conditions and attainments. All thoughts are transcendental. The Christian is a new creation. In the world he is not of it. His city is in heaven. The days of trial that remain are days of expectancy, in which he waits for the final adoption, the transfiguration

into the body of glory. The change is from the centre. The old laws of ritual observance, the new laws of rational duties, are alike superseded by a spiritual principle, the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus. This principle must permeate and dominate heart and life, purifying motive and purpose and intention, bringing every thought into captivity to its Lord, flooding the soul with the mind of Christ; making life one long service of love, never weary of well-doing, but always abounding in the work of the Lord.

This mystic union gives rise to symbolism, parallelism, and allegory. Christ lived and died, was buried, rose and was glorified and lives evermore. These facts, which are the basis of Christianity, supply imagery for the Christian life. While every point has its parallel, two are of fundamental significance—the Death and Resurrection. They are reproduced in the antithesis—dead unto sin, alive unto God (Rom. 6^{11}). Christ's death was a crucifixion: they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh (Gal. 5^{24}). The Resurrection was to a higher mode of existence: the believer must walk in newness of life (Rom. 6^{4}). These points, which indicate a conscious fellowship both in suffering and in triumph, are indefinitely enlarged. Thus Paul is "crucified to the world," and glories in that Cross by which he has attained deliverance (Gal. 6^{14}). Hence arises the ethic of self-abnegation; the self-denial, the lowliness of mind, the self-sacrifice which he exhibited and inculcated; hence also the breadth and depth of his interpretations of charity

(1 Cor. 13). Again, he lives the life of the Spirit—a life vitalised and actuated by the inner presence of the risen Christ. This relationship may be represented as a marriage of the soul with its Lord. Consequently conduct is the offspring of this spiritual union; and the graces of character or the achievements of goodness may be reckoned as heavenly fruit brought forth in human life to the praise of God (Rom. 7^4, Gal. 5^{22}). The life has thus two aspects. There is the human striving,—the contemplation of ideals, the steady gaze heavenward, the eager advance onward and upward. There is also God's working,—the help of the Spirit, the love of Christ constraining, the renewal and transformation as by the Lord, who is Spirit (Phil. 2^{13}, Rom. 8^{26}, 2 Cor. 3^{18} 4^{16}). The result must be a life totally different from the common experiences of men; a life rich in graces, as love, joy, peace, which breathe the atmosphere of heaven, rich also in all deeds that are righteous, honourable, and lovely (Gal. 5^{22}, Phil. 4^8).

Let us add three points of a more general character. One is the emphasis on *spirit*, in the secondary sense of the term, as opposed to the "letter" or form and as descriptive of inner reality. This idea of spirituality pertains to thought, worship, religious practice, moral life. It is always traceable, and often emphatic. Christianity itself is a ministration of the spirit (2 Cor. $3^{6\ 8}$); and in the passionate outburst to the Galatians this is the leading note. It is the same feeling as John often expresses by ἀλήθεια, the pain of externalism and unreality and

pretence. It is a mark of the ethical teachers of all ages, and distinctively of our Lord, to whom the formalism and insincerity of the Pharisee was a source of constant sorrow. And considering the strength and keenness of Paul's statements on this aspect and on faith, we may surely reckon it strange that some German scholars should regard him as a sacramentarian. The parallelism of baptism with the burial does not invest that stage or turning-point in a man's career with substantive value such as pertains to the great acts of will, the crucifixion to the world, and the recuperation in newness of life. Nor is there any text that connects the bestowal of Divine grace with outward observance, or with aught except personal, living, appropriating faith. A second and kindred point is *liberty*. This great thought arises as a reaction from the bondage of custom and the beggarliness of ceremony, but it has also a strictly moral significance, and it is sublimated into the free intercourse of the soul with its Redeemer. It is deliverance from the power and service of sin; it accompanies the activity of the Spirit; it gives the open vision, the unveiled intuition of the things of God (Rom. $6^{18.\ 22}$ $3^{17.\ 18}$). It belongs to the redemption wrought by Christ, and is a condition of the ultimate glory (Gal. 5^{1}, Rom. 8^{21}). This is a high theme, and we do not wonder that it is untouched in the other groups, and reappears only in John $8^{31\ 36}$. But however perilous the word, the thing itself is rightly conceived as a condition, and a goal, in all spiritual progress. And thirdly, this

thought *progress*. Moral life has an illimitable range. There are things that excel and transcend. The efforts towards spiritual knowledge and the apprehension of Christ bring wealth into the soul (Phil. 1^{10} 3^{12}). Love has a depth and richness and beauty which it may take ages to fathom (1 Cor. 13). As there is a downward course from iniquity unto iniquity, so there is an upward progression leading into sanctification (Rom. 6^{19}). Hence such favourite words as "abound," such phrases as "more and more," "from faith to faith," "from glory to glory," "onward," "upward," "unto eternal life" (Phil. 1^{9} 3^{12-14}, 2 Cor. 3^{18}, Rom. $6^{16.\ 19.\ 22}$).

3. Notable also are Paul's thoughts on the HISTORICAL development of religion. Modern conceptions of evolution are not to be expected; but laws of growth were dimly seen, and the revelation of God was co-ordinated with stages in the history of mankind. Paul's speech at Antioch of Pisidia (Acts 13) seems an accurate report, and the same manner is shown in the speech of Stephen. The new beginning and the racial problems threw religious thinkers back on a study of the past. And while some (like the author of our second group) are concerned only with voices of the prophets, others (like Paul, and perhaps Luke) endeavour to comprehend the plan of history and the decisive moments in the unfolding of the economy of redemption. In the background is the fall of Adam. A great step is marked by the call of Abraham, whose faith was rewarded with the promises. This was a commencement of true

religion, but a long training was necessary. Moses was summoned to be a leader and lawgiver. The law, that is to say, the Mosaic religion of commandments and ordinances, was laid on the people for restraint and guidance in the days of adolescence. A state of manhood, called the fulness of the time, is now reached. The religion of the adult is proclaimed, and the freedom of sonship is bestowed. The crisis of this stage lies in the reception of the Gentiles, which was part of the Abrahamic promise and which requires the supersession of the Mosaic ordinances by the older Abrahamic principle of faith. The realisation of these facts and changes involves the recognition in the perfect religion of the twin principles of spirituality and universality. But as the apostle looks around him in the world he finds that now (as always) only a remnant of Israel are inwardly true. Into this remnant a new tree is engrafted—the faithful of the Gentiles. These are they to whom the Messiah has commissioned him to preach; and in this greater readiness to hear he sees evidence of the predominance, in the near future, of the new races. But this ethnic advancement will rouse the old people; and the fulness of the Gentiles—the realisation in them of God's purposes of grace—will be followed by a new fulness of the chosen people of old, and thus will be completed the ways and will of God. In this eager exploration of national history, where equal emphasis is laid on the election of God and the obedience of man, we have an instance of quite distinctive

intellectual activity. The question appealed in some measure to every one of that age. The purely religious aspects reappear, transformed, in the Epistle to the Ephesians; but the wide-eyed survey of the movements of time, the anxious concern in racial conflict, and the strong patriotic interest are Paul's alone. In him this phase of controversy was concentrated; with the triumph of his cause his idea passed into a commonplace of thought.

4. In a final section let us look at the MAN, and in the three aspects of personality, missionary ardour, and literary qualification. These five Epistles reveal personality. All are genuine letters. They are not essays in literature. Their form is not artificial. They go forth from a man's heart, and are directly written to the persons addressed. They convey living thoughts, actual feelings, desires, or purposes. Therefore there is nothing abstract and general. All are directed to questions of the moment. All deal with existing situations, answering inquiries, grappling with difficulties, taking notice of rumours, giving counsel, encouragement, or reproof. They are not addressed to the Church at large or to the world; not composed for literary readers or for posterity. The author writes precisely what, if he were present, he would say in conversation or in the public meeting. With his thoughts are blended his emotions,—anger or love, hope or fear, anticipation or rejoicing. There is no literary artifice. These things are evident of all except *Romans*. That Epistle is not, like the others,

called forth by circumstances. The readers or recipients are a community unknown. But the writer seems, with apostolic authority tinctured and softened by personal humility, to be addressing persons whom he hopes soon to visit for purposes of religious edification. His subject is therefore not local difficulties but the common faith. And if, consequently, there is less of personal matter there is instead a greater measure of subjective experience. His theme is the Gospel in its foundation and its fulness. The Epistle therefore contains a large wide outlook; but the author himself, in his thoughts and in the emotions of his soul, is revealed as fully as when he is addressing friends of intimate association. Even should the Epistle be deemed artificial in form it would none the less bear the impress of the author's personality. Now in these respects Paul's Epistles are distinguished from all others. Only in 1 Thess. 1–3 is there a superficial resemblance or imitation, with nothing of psychological or spiritual significance; and again in 2 Timothy some reminiscence or interpretation of the manner and words of the apostle.

Paul's letters breathe an earnest desire for the salvation of souls. Like his Master he was constrained or straitened so that the work of his calling could in no case be put by. He was under a sense of paramount obligation to Jew and Greek; and, when he was not thinking of an individual Church which he had founded, his mind was directed either towards his own race, for whose

sake he was willing to surrender his eternal well-being, or to the great outside world, for whose evangelisation he was specially ordained. From behind and above every controversy and peril his voice speaks to us: "be ye steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord." In this also he is unique. Others doubtless laboured faithfully, fearless of martyrdom. But we are referring to Epistles. Paul's spirit is partially reproduced in the Timothean group. Elsewhere we have directions regarding the organisation and management of the existing churches, or exhortation in view of the failure of so many to separate themselves for ever from the past. But this is different from Paul the pioneer and enthusiastic founder. In the second group we hear the stately tones of the preacher, and in the Pastorals we learn the varied duties of the ministry. In neither is work for the outside world contemplated. In Ephesians, indeed, we have an exposition of the idea which was embodied in the task of Paul's life. Therein we may read the philosophy of missions. But in Paul's letters we touch the living man; we feel the eager mind, the beating heart, the throbbing soul, the soaring spirit; we behold the consecrated apostle to whom the conversion of the world is not a philosophy, or a problem of intellectual disquisition, or a mystery now revealed, but a matter of urgent duty and of Divine commission.

5. The last point is literary STYLE. Paul was in our judgment a Cromwell rather than a Milton;

and we can easily understand his inferiority to Apollos either in philosophic exposition or in sonorous eloquence. His education was rabbinical, and we cannot claim for him the culture and the polish of one trained in the humanities or disciplined by the rhetoricians of Greece. Dean Alford, referring to one of the most literary of his Epistles, the *Philippians*, contrasted its "discontinuous and abrupt style," which nevertheless gives "wonderful revelations of the human heart and of the Divine purposes," with the smooth flow of the *Ephesians*, which covers "depths under depths, wonderful systems of parallel allusion, frequent and complicated under-plots." Yet in the splendid eloquence and elaborate stateliness of the latter we find far fewer of those intuitions of genius that lighten up for us history and character and doctrine. Paul is fresh, original, direct, daring, masterful in thought and pointed in expression. His ideas of a forensic theology and a mystic morality are by no means the most natural. His terminology of life and death, of law and promise, of flesh and spirit is widely different from ours. His spiritualising methods of interpretation have passed from the modern mind. Yet his doctrines are stated with an intellectual vigour which makes them clear to all except those who would wish them to be somewhat other. But, whatever differences may be felt, this ardent, profound, persuasive personality arrests us as no other does, and creates the impression that he (apart from John) is the one representative of apostolic

thought, and that his teaching covers the whole field of theology and of duty. Such is the power of a rich spiritual experience and of a sympathetic and masterful personality. For through the style shines the man, a mystic indeed, but the most practical of mystics, a leader who conquered in the struggle and will lead us into light.

In sentence-structure his mark and mannerism is antithesis. He has favourite contrasts, such as oppose the outward and the inward, the form and the reality, or the condemnation and the acquittal. One of these is "flesh" and "spirit," which has given rise to volumes on volumes of learned and laborious misconception. "Flesh" is not a theological or moral term. It is used by Paul in the elucidation of spirit, being something outward, objective, visible. As body is the antithesis of soul, so flesh may be opposed to spirit. It means nothing dreadful. Paul uses it for the natural man, and for the sinful man, and for the body of Jesus, and (where no flesh is in it) for mere form and ceremony (Gal. 3^3). His theme is the "spirit." This habit of antithesis presents itself in single but emphatic words: in phrases, as newness of the spirit, oldness of the letter; in short sentences, where two terms are contrasted (as Phil. 1^{21}, Rom. $5^{18.\,19}$, 1 Cor. $15^{48.\,49}$); or in longer sentences, where three terms of the one face three of the other (Rom. 5^{10} 6^{23} 10^{10}). But intricate structure or complicated succession of clauses is unknown. By these clear contrasts his normal thought is

expressed; but there is also the antithesis of startling paradox, as in 1 Cor. $1^{21.\ 25}$, and an occasional playfulness of thought and language. Like all true geniuses, he has capacities of tenderness, gifts of humour, moods of banter or of scorn, much of which is lost to us in the gravity of his theme or our ignorance of the circumstances. The personal letter in Rom. 16 shows in its many references a rich, vivid, and sympathetic personality.

To Paul also, as to a Shakespeare, belongs the element of the unexpected,—glimpses and penetrations that carry us outside the accepted scheme of thought. Such are his visions and revelations (2 Cor. 12^{1}, Gal. 1^{1}, etc.), his spiritualising interpretations (Rom. 4. 7, Gal. 4), his paradoxes of history (Rom. 11^{30-32}), his groanings of creation (Rom. 8^{22}, 2 Cor. 5^{2}), his seed-corn and bodies celestial (1 Cor. 15). Such also subjectively the sunrise on his soul (2 Cor. 4), his gradations of spiritual experience (Rom. 5), his consciousness of the indwelling Christ, his gospel of spiritual freedom. So also his great outbursts, such as the Ode of Love (1 Cor. 13), or the peroration of faith in Rom. 8, where we feel the heart of the poet or the soul of the orator. So again, the largeness and hopefulness of outlook which has taught us to seek a soul of goodness in things evil (Rom. 5^{3} 8^{28}).

Paul was no mere theologian and preacher. He knew the world he lived in. He drew figures from the fields and the buildings, the temple and

the home. He saw God in Nature. His mind ranged over history. His fingers touched the gamut of human life. Where else in the Epistles shall we find such imagery and humour, such originality and such charm?

CHAPTER VI

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS, AND KINDRED EPISTLES

WE now come to the second part of our subject, the writings which we have assigned not to the apostle himself, but to his three associates, Luke, Silas, and Timothy; and according to conventional arrangement we shall take the Pastoral Epistles last. Assigned by us to Silas, and bearing the name of Paul, we have only one complete treatise, the eloquent Epistle to the Ephesians. This we shall examine first, and then glance at the other two treatises, which seem closely allied. The remaining parts are fragments, and of a more general kind. Thus the exhortation of Rom. 12. 13 has no special relation to the Epistle to which it is appended, and its position may have been given to it after its author's life was over. Similarly the two portions of the Thessalonian Epistles may have been edited by the younger teacher to whom we have assigned the complementary half of these documents. Beyond these a much more important question is suggested, namely, that in the enlarged and reconstructed record of the Galilæan ministry and teaching, known as the First Gospel, we hear the

same accent as in *Ephesians* or *Hebrews*; so that we can know that the man who has given us the Sermon on the Mount and the high conceptions of Christ's Person and work which that gospel contains was one who had lived in intimate association with the apostles in Jerusalem. These fragmentary parts and the evidence for this suggestion will occupy another chapter.

It falls within our purpose to show that in thought and doctrinal terminology the three Epistles—Hebrews, 1 Peter, and Ephesians—are essentially the same. But in appearance they differ largely. The parties addressed are different, being respectively the Jews, the Dispersion or Græco-Jewish world, and the Gentiles. The purposes are different, though this difference may be due only to the mental habit and attitude of the races addressed. The general form, the tone, the colouring are different, though such general effects may be attributed either to local circumstances of the time or to the stage in the writer's experience, or to conscious effort to reproduce the manner of the special founder under whose name the manifesto goes forth. From such considerations of cause or motive it is manifest that if the Epistles proceeded from the same pen it would have been natural for the writer to make them so dissimilar that only a subtle or scientific reader could discern the fundamental unity. And it would have been his duty to put into each as much as possible of the distinctive thought and language of the master in

whose name he spoke. *Ephesians* is a manifesto of Paulinism; and our task now is to trace or to indicate its essential harmony with, its unconscious divergence from, the mind and the methods of the Apostle of the Gentiles.

In form and style—wherein we may include purpose, method, arrangement, expression—it is widely remote from Paul. It is not a letter. Neither the author's personality nor the reader's need is indicated. Circumstances of production, questions of controversy, of organisation, of friendship, and of the many normal causes of communication, are unexpressed. It is, in short, a literary essay where author and audience are alike unknown.

The designation is unknown. The reading *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* cannot be correct, inasmuch as Paul was intimate with all the Ephesians, while the readers of this Epistle are not supposed to necessarily know anything of Paul. Such a mistake as addressing chapter 3 to Ephesus no possible author could have made. The Epistle is in reality an address to the Gentiles; and inasmuch as *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* is in most of the MSS. (being omitted from others most probably on account of its inherent improbability) we venture to hazard the conjecture that *Ἐφέσῳ* is a misreading of *ἔθνεσιν*. None the less it is, possibly enough, the Epistle referred to in Col. 4^{16}. But *Colossians* itself is in the category of critical problems. And as nothing is said of the readers, of their divisions, or errors, or trials, or kindnesses, or of the conduct of church affairs, so also nothing

is said of the writer—of his plans or purposes, his annoyances and discouragements, his emotions of hope or joy or anger, his anxious inquiries or confident assurances; nothing of his inward spiritual strivings, of his enriching experiences, of that wealth of the inner life in which (alongside of bodily weaknesses and sufferings) the genuine Epistles of Paul abound. And for these latter there was now more occasion than ever. Could Paul have written in captivity without telling of his sorrows, he who, years before he reached Rome, was "dying daily"? Could he have written to any church in Asia without bursts of affectionate emotion, he who had brethren beloved in Christ wherever the name of Christ was known? Are we to suppose that in his prison cell this bent and bruised apostle blossomed forth into a magnificent rhetorician and preacher, without a furrow on his cheek, without a rent in his body, without a pang in his heart; a rhetorician, in form systematic and regular, in language imaginative and eloquent, in conception profound and noble; a preacher who disdained the common incidence of life, the common feelings of brotherly connection while he soared loftily above his audience and set forth only the counsels of eternity? If this is Paul, he is transformed indeed. Rather will we believe that the spirit of Paul lives in the address to the elders of Ephesus at Miletus; because that memorable scene of tearful affection and of triumphant trial has been painted for us either by an eye-witness or by a historian possessed of historic and dramatic and

spiritual insight. In it we feel the man who under Christ founded the Gentile Church.

The style of *Ephesians* is literary. Through the spectacles of books (to use Dryden's unforgettable metaphor) this man has looked on the problems of religion. In books he has learned the tricks of style : the careful balance, the pleasing alliteration, the skilfully adjusted succession of clauses, the elaborate mosaic of words. A good example is seen in his picture of the soldier, drawn in outline (as we suppose) from Homer and the armour of Agamemnon, painted with colours from the Old Testament and the Apocrypha ; the earlier draughts, carefully improved upon, until at last a perfect picture is obtained. Though writing to Gentiles, he quotes about thirty times the language of the Old Testament; and doubtless there are other thirty instances of less obvious reminiscence. In systematic form of exposition we see for the first and last time an equal division of the doctrinal and practical parts. No such division was conceivable to Paul, or is reconcilable with his mode of thought. The very distinction of doctrinal and practical was unknown to him. Even here in the ethical teaching the underlying dogma repeatedly breaks forth, revealing more clearly than the doctrinal part the writer's doctrinal standpoint.

Here then, rather than in 1 Peter or Hebrews or Thessalonians, all of which have a corresponding division, we see the writer's perfect method. And we can infer the sense of delighted duty with which he saw the Roman Epistle rounded

off with its ethical and practical additions. Again, we observe the love of triplicity; and we are sometimes in doubt whether the writer is indicating a Trinity in the Godhead or simply exhibiting the Jewish love of three. In the practical division, the Christian walk is in love and light and wisdom, the fruit of the light is in righteousness and truth and goodness, there is one faith, one hope, one baptism, social duties are of three types (husbands, parents, masters), the armour is in two triplicities. Again, there are, ten times over, those wonderful sentences in which clauses rise one out of another, with new developments and connections of thought, forming tower-like structures of language and of mental architecture. (Such are 1^{3-14} 1^{15-23} 2^{1-10} 2^{14-18} 2^{19-22} 3^{2-7} 3^{8-12} 3^{14-19} 4^{11-16} 6^{14-20}.) And again, there are the sublime visions of the growing temple and the compacted body, of the mysterious principalities and the wrestling world-rulers, of the heavenlies and the eternities, of the purposes and pleasure and counsel of God. All this artificiality and evenness of form on the one hand, and imaginativeness of spiritual conception on the other, are as remote as possible from the manner of Paul. *He* plunged at once into the question of the hour, addressed his readers directly in praise or blame. Saw the purposes of God in history rather than in abstraction, based his teaching on visions and experiences, but brought all to the test of the historic and living groundwork of redemption. Paul's Epistles contain difficulties of their own, with his metaphors of life and death, his

flesh and spirit, his allegorical interpretations, his defective syntax, his singularities and angularities of thought and expression. He is a gnarled oak tree, while this other writer's emblem is the stately pine or palm. He is often abrupt, metaphorical, obscure. But he has no sentence of complicated structure or interwoven argument, or piled-up succession of consequence and cause. He has no divisions rounded with doxologies, no triads of thought or expression, no literary artifice, no chasing of the charm of words. He is a master-builder, not expatiating on the heavenlies, or pursuing the power of the air, but concerned rather with the law and way of life.

Yet Ephesians is a thoroughly Pauline Epistle; in which the apostle's voice is heard as Socrates may be supposed to be heard in Plato,—heard in this case and easily recognised. Its fundamental thought, the Headship of Christ, is readily derivable from Paul's conception of the Second Adam, the One in whose death His people died, and through whose obedience the many will be made righteous. Its conceptions of unity are based on the teaching of him who saw in Christ neither Jew nor Gentile, bond nor free. Similarly of the doctrines of grace. The forensic garb is dropped, and its underlying fact, the remission of sins through the blood of Christ, is simply announced (1^{7}), as is also condonation for Christ's sake (4^{32}). A sort of humanism has smoothed the stern substitutionary doctrine of the apostle and modified the meaning of his redemption. A mild Paulinism appears also in its form of the

doctrine of adoption; but election in Christ and predestination to an unblemished condition show a falling short of the position of the apostle ($1^{4.5}$, cf. Rom. 8^{29}), whose conception included a substantial Divine resemblance. Again, the doctrine of reconciliation reappears, but certainly in a new conception and application. The background of enmity and alienation and hostility is wanting. It is the conciliation mainly of the Gentiles, who as hitherto ignorant of God were far off, and are now brought nigh as the Jews for ages have already been. Yet to both (now united in one commonwealth) is the message of "peace," giving access in one Spirit to the Father. This doctrine of the Reconciler who brings men to God is not quite the same as that which asserted that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself," and which coupled therewith the Divine appeal: "be ye reconciled to God." It represents the Christian position of advantage, not as freedom from condemnation, or as consciousness of adoption, or as a firm standing-ground of assurance, but as free access to God,—the thought of a devout mind which estimates the privileges of the sanctuary above the experiences of the soul that has fought life's fiercest battles. And again, the Death of Christ is conceived in its moral effects as an act of self-surrender with a view to the purifying and perfecting of a church in which Christ would realise His own true being. The text $5^{26.27}$ is to be read along with 5^{2} (which contains its theology); together they express Divine Love employing

itself in cleansing and sanctifying with a view to the formation of a people perfectly holy and blessed. Grace is emphasised as the ground of salvation, and the riches thereof are to be seen in the future. Beautiful Pauline language; yet not quite the same as a reign of grace supplanting that of law, or grace regarded as sustaining and inspiring the preacher, and as abounding here in manifold application (Rom. 6, 1 Cor. 15^{10}).

The future is to Paul a manifestation, not of grace but of glory. Similarly, faith is not unessential. But assuredly there is nothing in *Ephesians* of the vividness of that faith which lays hold of the Saviour, constitutes an intimate fellowship of life and life's experiences, and is the active principle of the Christian's whole existence. "By grace, through faith, not of works, not with glorying"; according to the principles of the master. And the problem (in James) of the relations of faith and works can be solved by an epigram; "we are His workmanship, created for good works." The Spirit is introduced eleven times [in the Spirit (5), of the Spirit, (2), through the Spirit, with the Spirit (2), the Holy Spirit of promise, the Holy Spirit of God (2)]. But the old phrases, walking, living in the Spirit, led by the Spirit; the conceptions of mutual relationship between the human and the Divine Spirit; the assurance that the indwelling Spirit constitutes Divine Sonship and will quicken and immortalise the body—these return not. And Righteousness, which in Paul is objective, heavenly, a master to be served, a goal to be

reached, is here ethical, subjective, human, the designation of right conduct among men. The doctrine of the Church also, in which this Epistle makes so notable an advance, has its basis in Paul. While he applied the term *ecclesia* only to the local community, he realised the Christian world as the Israel of God, as a commonwealth whose metropolis is in heaven, the Jerusalem above, our true mother (Gal. 4^{26}, Phil. 3^{20}). And it is this central idea that in Ephesians is variously expanded.

Perhaps the most marked dependence of phraseology is on 2 Corinthians. In it, as here, Paul writes as an "apostle by the will of God." The commencement, "Blessed be the God and Father of . . ." reproduced in 1 Peter, appears once more in Ephesians. The quotation (2^{15}) a "sweet savour," with the terms *εὐωδία* and *ὀσμή* separately employed, appears in Eph. 5^2 in the more original form *ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας* (but so in Phil. 4^{18}). A more genuine example of modification is in the reproduction of the words, "Who also sealed us and gave us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts" (1^{22}, cf. 5^5). In Eph. 1^{14} this appears as "ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is an earnest of our inheritance"; and again (4^{30}), the "Holy Spirit of God in whom ye were sealed unto the day of redemption." In Paul the "earnest" and the "sealing" are distinct, the latter as well as the former being attributed to God. Once again, Paul's earnest or (as he elsewhere puts it) first-fruits suggests an inner experience of sublime consciousness, not something notable to others which may be regarded

as a seal or guarantee. The expression "the glory of the Father" (Rom. 6^4) reappears as the "Father of glory" (Eph. 1^{17}). So "promise of the Spirit" (Gal. 3^{14}) reappears as "Spirit of promise" (1^{14}). Expressions such as, "the old man," "bond or free," "newness of life," "a new creation," reappear, some of them unchanged, others (if more subjective) reconceived and it may be transformed.

The author's mind is steeped in Paulinism. He omits indeed the Law, and all legal phraseology, either because his own mind was of the opposite type or because the Gentile readers were not interested in a phase of religion that was ended. And he omits the struggles of the flesh and the spirit, and the triumph of inward peace, because his own conceptions of the moral conflict (6^{12}) are entirely different. But he goes out of his way to recall the old words "circumcision and uncircumcision" (2^{11}), which belonged to the time when Jews were predominant in the Church; he mentions the Cross (2^{16}), writes of death and disobedience ($2^{1.\ 2}$), and though he understands neither faith nor love as Paul understood them, he recognises the value of both in the upbuilding and unifying of the Church. He has in truth a system of his own which his reproductions of Paulinism tend only to support. To this system of thought correspond his conceptions of "truth" and "faith," of access and boldness, his transformation of the metaphors of the body and the temple, his conception of the Headship of Christ and of the sphere of the Holy Spirit. Can we indicate this system?

Here, if it be true, as Jülicher (*Ency. Bib.*) observes, that no one "has as yet quite succeeded in pointing out any very clear and consecutive process of thought or methodical elaboration of definite themes," the task must be considered difficult. And in fact, expositions abound which, while professing to be exhaustive, contain no reference whatever to what the present writer regards as the central and pervading thread of thought. But the reason is, that European writers, in their modern conditions of civilisation, have no living consciousness of the problems that agitated the first century, creating the perfervid atmosphere in which the Church was planted. Our burning questions have little relation to the burning questions that surrounded apostles; and modern ignorance could not be better illustrated than in the assumptions of theologians and divines about the temporary or occasional character of the controversy that called forth the four Epistles. These questions were not temporary but fundamental. They began, for Paul, the first day he preached Christ; they faced him at every turn in his apostolate, and he escaped from them only when he was crowned in death. One aspect of the question was raised in the life of Christ, and was a main motive of the Crucifixion. The problem broke forth in Stephen; and it gathered new and various force as Gentiles were admitted into the fold. Only when the power passed from them did the Jews cease to destroy those of their race who would venture to break down the barriers that kept Gentiles from

their temple and their feasts. It was therefore in the face of lifelong antagonism that Paul maintained his ideal of a community in which there was neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female. Of that union the symbol was the Supper, in which, in defiance of ancient law, the "clean" and the "unclean" partook together of the sacred meal. Against such a feast the whole old world rebelled, until such time as it saw Christianity established as a separate and tolerated religion.

The "gospel" as understood by Paul, if preached in its fulness and directness to strict Jews, would have called forth no measured dissent, but the darkened face, the furious scowl, and the teeth-gnashing determination of men whose one feeling was the impulse of revenge. Less intense, but by no means dormant, were the decaying faiths of paganism. There were Jewish fanaticism and Gentile fanaticism and Imperial fanaticism; and the "things sacrificed to idols" a Gentile Christian could refuse only at the peril of his life. Yet an age had arrived when the outward conditions of intercommunication and of kindred systems of education and common modes of thinking widely prevailed, when the unreason of race-seclusions must have been manifest to the general body of unprejudiced and uninterested men. In this age of priestly bigotry and widespread unbelief and multitudinous decadence, the thought of the risen and universal Christ touched the imaginations of spiritually minded men; and the followers of the apostles under that heavenly inspiration banded

themselves together as a company, sworn to reform the world through the spiritual reformation of themselves. They knew no race or nationality, no law or pattern, but that which was of heavenly make; and under their celestial banner they drew together in one new army what was best and noblest within the wide extent of the Roman world. By the end of the seventh decade, when the old Temple was destroyed and the power it symbolised was broken, the foundations of the new spiritual temple were laid, sanctified with the blood of "apostles and prophets" who had followed in the train of their Lord. When, in the next decade, *Ephesians* was written the progress of the Church seemed secure. The fiery trial was past, and persecution had consolidated the Church. Paul's visions were being surely realised. They had come to the "city of the living God," not the Palestinian but the heavenly Jerusalem. They constituted an all-embracing assembly of the first-born whose names were already enrolled in heaven. And they exhibited in the world a new type of manhood after no earthly standard, but after the pattern of Him who had descended from heaven.

Full to overflowing with such thoughts, and realising the greatness of the principles accepted now for the first time in the history of our world ($3^{5.9}$), the writer puts into the mouth of the apostolic founder a grand enunciation, both in respect of eternal purpose and of historic fulfilment, of the work of heavenly grace in the creation of a holy and universal brotherhood of the redeemed and

glorified. Paul the Jew had been the outstanding preacher and apostle of the gospel to the Gentiles. In his mind had the work of Christ first been conceived as a revelation of truth in the light of which all merely bodily distinctions had vanished; by him had first been clearly formulated that union of Jew and Gentile as citizens of equal rights in a polity whose constitution and hopes belonged to the sphere of spirit and the region of the eternal. To him who rejoiced in his humility was this great grace given. His therefore is the doctrine, whoever may chance to be the successive expounders thereof.

The main conception of the Epistle may be approached either from the Divine or from the human side; either as exhibiting the growth and manifestation of the community in the world, or as setting forth the work of Him who is at once Founder and Lord. In respect of this Divine work the Epistle may not extravagantly be regarded as a great poem, the epic of the Resurrection. Its motive may be conceived as that of Milton or Pope, to "justify the ways of God to men," exhibiting the providence of God in the arrangement and culmination of history. In the centre and climax of the Epistle this aim is announced, that "now unto the principalities and powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the Church the manifold wisdom of God." Something of the Miltonic rebellion of angels and ruin of man is in the background; and the intermediate spaces between earth and heaven are peopled with spirits

jealous and hostile. Christ the Lord of man has entered into human afflictions, has triumphed, and is exalted far above the highest of the spiritual powers. His people share in His resurrection, being made alive, and uplifted and enthroned with Him in the heavenlies ($2^{5.6}$). Therefore in the unfolding of the ages will be seen the riches of God's grace, and the works of goodness and holiness that flow therefrom to God's glory. And this will be realised through the creation of that community of which Christ is the source and the life, and which may be described as the sphere in which He who filleth all things realises His own fulfilment ($1^{22.23}$). This new commonwealth therefore will exhibit before the angels and spiritual lordships the greatness of its Head; and in showing forth the manifold wisdom of the Divine counsel and government will redound to the praise of the triune God.

If we look from the human or earthly side and trace the idea through the dogmatic exposition we find it continuous and pervasive. The keynote is struck in 1^{10}, where in a single word (gather together in one) Christ's work is exhaustively described. This counsel of eternity and this choice before time ($1^{4.5}$) await the "fulness of the times" when the purpose of redemption takes historic effect (1^{10}). What is the exact force of this term *ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι* which describes God's purpose, and which we have called the keynote? To "sum up all things in Christ," say the Revisers. But the meaning of this expression is by no means clear. We sum up symbols, not things. Is it meant that

Christ is the sum and substance of all created things? And how does such a supposition differ from Pantheism? Surely the emphasis is on the root "head," and the double meaning is expressed of uniting God's separated creation, and of effecting the unity through correlation to one Head. The Headship extends over angels and men; the unity concerns all creation. But the practical point for the moment is the reconciliation of races, the drawing together of men of all lands in a common faith and life and hope, the undoing of that separation of peoples and tribes and tongues which sin had produced in our world. Ideas of philosophy might bring men into sympathy; but a real union could be effected only through a living Lord whose word and will would constitute the law of the world-wide society. In Him we (Jews) who had looked forward to the Messiah were made a heritage; in Him ye of the Gentiles also who believed received the seal which is the assurance of co-partnership in the same Divine inheritance (1^{11-14}).

The remaining sentence of the chapter sets forth the greatness of this Head in His exaltation above all rule, authority, power, and dominion on the one hand, and in his supremacy over the Church on the other (1^{21-23}). The description of the Church as the body and the pleroma must be regarded in part as a figure derived from the body politic, and as setting forth the double idea that Christ's Kingdom is to be seen in His people, and that the true subjects are those already possessed by His Spirit.

But this exaltation of Christ who was crucified is an evidence both of the marvellous power of God and of the greatness of the Christian calling (1^{18-20}). And of this latter a supreme proof is given (2^{1-10}) in the moral exaltation already undergone. The believers have been made alive with Christ out of their death of sin; they have shared not only the Resurrection but the Exaltation (a non-Pauline addition), so that in the fulness of their privileges and enjoyments they may be said to be already seated in the heavenlies. And this high honour is the joint possession of Jews and Gentiles; for both had sinned deeply, and are alike saved by grace, and consequent on the Divine love are guided by God into lives of honourable beneficence (2^{8-10}).

These three sentences, constituting the first half of the doctrinal section, state in absolute language the more general principles of Christian redemption. In the three that follow the writer comes into closer relationship with his leading idea. The word "He is our Peace" is the keynote now. Here the separateness of Jew and Gentile is vigorously pictured. A commonwealth of true worshippers did indeed exist, but the Gentiles were outside and far off. Covenants with God were the basis thereof, but the Gentiles (worshipping non-entities) were without God and without hope. And between the races, commandments in ordinances, constituting walls of partition, had been carefully constructed. Between the two there existed a condition which the writer describes by that term "enmity" which

Paul had used to designate the profound moral alienation of man from God. Yet out of this forbidding situation a new and higher commonwealth is to be created, with a new higher type of citizen and of service. This union of opposites, however, is no mere coadjustment or coalition or fusion, such as for earthly ends may sometimes be effected. The heavenly temple has its foundations deep beyond our measuring and its turrets high beyond our gaze. The enmity Christ abolished "in His flesh," that in His Spirit the twain might be blended into one (2^{15}). The exact meaning of this passage is perhaps difficult, both in the phrase "having abolished in his flesh the enmity," and in the second statement thereof, "having slain the enmity" in the Cross; and it may be compared with the more or less parallel passage, Heb. 10^{19-22}, where access is "in the blood," by a way through the veil, His flesh. The passage is related to such a sentence in Paul as "dead to the law through the body of Christ" (Rom. 7^{4}). The death of Christ had a significance which was symbolised in the rending of the Temple veil. No longer were the sacred mysteries of the worship of Jehovah barred from the view of the outside world. With the piercing of the body of Christ the old Temple was shattered and the epoch of Judaism was accomplished. With the Resurrection or quickening in the Spirit the new Temple began in which no veil and no ordinances perpetuated the old antagonism. The barriers are abolished, and the two in one body are reconciled to God; and

the message of peace has gone forth from the risen Christ (through His apostles) to the far-off Gentile and the near-at-hand Jew, announcing that through Christ, and in His Spirit, both have access unto God. Consequently, on this Divine foundation the common citizenship is established and the united commonwealth is reared. Alienation is no more to be thought of. Various lands may contribute their various wings or several buildings. But the many-mansioned dome is a harmonious holy temple in the Lord, yea, a sanctuary which is a dwelling-place of the Spirit of God (2^{19-22}).

This is the whole matter; but it must be set forth more fully in its eternal significance (3^{1-12}), —on the one hand as a union of men who are "fellow-heirs and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the promise" (3^{6}), and on the other hand as a matter affecting the entire universe of being ($3^{10.\ 11}$). It is accordingly the great mystery of Christ, the Divine scheme unimagined of men in the past, and now in the fulness of the time revealed. It exhibits the riches of grace, yea, the unsearchable riches of Christ (3^{8}), and it shows to men and angels the manifold wisdom of the Author of all things ($3^{9.\ 10}$). To this has history tended, herein has it culminated. And of this mature faith, with its unveiled purpose and its assured confidence, Paul, like another Moses, has been made the messenger and inaugurator ($3^{9.\ 12}$). What can be added save the prayer to the God and Father of all that His people grounded in love (which is the bond of perfectness and union) may

be able to realise the illimitable dimensions of the Divine purpose and goodness in the upbuilding of the city of God?

The three following chapters we distinguish as the ethical or practical division. But we shall find that the dominating conceptions of unity and headship have not ceased to govern. Unity is the theme of the first great moral exhortation (4^{1-16}); the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, the unity in love of a body fitly framed and knit together. Secondly (4^{17-32}), this unity must exist on the basis and through the medium of a new and true manhood. No longer are they to be reckoned Jews as the bigots of old, or Gentiles as they once lived in their pagan cities. They are one new man (2^{15}), *i.e.* Christlike, renewed in the spirit of their mind, purged from uncleanness, and after God created in righteousness and holiness of truth (3^{24}). And the unity must show itself in the consciousness of mutual membership, which gives a new basis of moral conduct; requiring perfect veracity (4^{25}), conversation that is edifying (4^{29}), honest and benevolent industry (4^{28}), patience, sympathy, forgiveness, kindness, and all the virtues of social brotherhood ($4^{26.\ 31.\ 32}$). Further, this new life must be understood in relation not only to fellow-citizens, but also to the Head. Therefore it must be an imitation of Christ's life, a walk in holy love and heavenly light, with nothing of defilement or darkness (5^{1-14}), a life of spiritual joy and

diligent activity in the conscious fellow-service of the Lord (5^{15-21}).

There is no relationship of life and no social duty that may not be reinterpreted in the light of these new principles. God is the Father from whom every fatherhood or family is named (3^{15}). In Christ and His Church is the heavenly counterpart of connubial union (5^{23-33}); and in Christ's enterprise for the redemption and perfecting and beautifying of His Bride, the husband must learn a law of chivalrous service. Of earthly masters and servants the Lord is the common Master (6^{9}), and the consciousness thereof may ennoble the humblest toil. Finally, the Epistle closes with that magnificent appeal for moral strength and energy which seems, indeed, addressed to the individual rather than the community, but which regards the individual as one who must be prepared for any emergency that may arise or any effort that may be needed in the life of the citizen of a great State. Nation encounters nation on equal terms of warfare. But the foe of the Christian citizen is an unseen agency of evil; and the Church of the living God is confronted and surrounded by the spiritual hosts of wickedness. Hence the Christian requires an armour of his own of celestial metal and tempering, and along with that armour the strength and the steadfastness that come from closeness to his Head and from consequent possession of the Spirit that unites him with God (6^{10-18}). Such strength of heart and head and heavenly helps was specially needed in that age of subtle

seductions and of fiery trials when the constant wrestling had to be encountered and the deadly dart had to be repelled, and when before them loomed the "evil day" of the triumphant malice of the foe.

This system of thought is essentially Pauline. This conception of the Church as a unity, as all-embracing, as depending on Christ as its Head or Lord, as animated or inspired by the Divine Spirit, as constituting a community for mutual help, as requiring a new type of manhood, a new moral standard, a new law of life, is Paul's conception translated into the language of a younger generation. It would almost seem as if the writer did not venture on any idea or leading term that had not the sanction of the apostle. Thus the appeal for unity through lowliness, the conception of the Christian as a new man, or of life as a walk, and even as a warfare, are Paul's, though the handling is entirely new; and unless it be the conception of Christ as the perfect man unto whose stature we are to grow (Eph. 4^{13}, transformed from 2 Cor. 3^{18} by direct reference to the human life of Jesus), there is perhaps no ethical idea that can be called entirely original. But the thoughts and even the very words of Paul, when we have them, come through a mind that was cast in another mould. Thus we have the fulness of the times (not *χρονοῦ* but *καιρῶν*) applied not to the Incarnation but to the subsequent effect; the nothingness of race or national distinctions, though Paul's historic arguments and outlines disappear in a broad

philosophy; the oneness of the community as a Church of God, though in Paul the wider oneness has not yet sought expression; the supreme authority of Christ, who in Paul is the new Adam, but here is the Head into which the parts grow, or the chief corner-stone on which the building rests, or the One in whom all is gathered up; the figure of the body changed from an active organism in which members constitute the head (Christ being the inner life), to a vague organisation of which the members do not form the head and which may be conceived either after the analogy of a living body or simply of an organised State; and similarly the transformation of the Temple from the individual body to the body of the community; the spirituality of the whole, not, however, in such contrasts as the letter and the spirit but in such loftier language as a "habitation of God in the Spirit"; and, highest of all, the supreme Fatherhood of God, not that He has given us the spirit of adoption, but that He is the Archetype and Author of every existing fatherhood. The Pauline view is modified and transcended by the writer's less scientific and more philosophic cast of thought. His conceptions are not directed to the working out of historic problems in the exigencies of our world. He sees things in the light of the absolute. The Church is formed, the community is chosen, the fabric is framed, and the principles decreed before the birth of time. It is not a new stage in the onward progress of revelation, but the sudden institution of the perfect religion, by the revealing,

at the appointed moment, of a mystery hitherto hid. It is not merely "the word of the Cross" as Paul preached, but "the word of the truth of the Gospel." Here, as in John, Christianity is "the truth."

But while thus in his fervid imagination the writer transcends the view-point and method of Paul, he also, by omission and reconception, diverges not a little from the Master. There is (as we shall see) a different conception of the fundamental fact of the Atonement; an absence of the doctrinal and ethical representation of the Resurrection, its place being supplied by the Exaltation, along with which are introduced the principalities and lordships; an absence of that mystic union of the believer with Christ so intensely conceived and variously expressed in Paul, and instead thereof an objective standard and an objective faith (4^{13}); an absence of the distinctive charisms of the first generation and the attribution of gifts directly to God; an absence of such inner experience as is portrayed in those outlines of Christian bliss and spiritual ripening in Rom. 5, or in that hymn of love (1 Cor. 13) in which the human heart is unveiled and the true beauty of life interpreted; while instead we have the new conceptions of duty (veracity, self-sacrifice, benevolence) which arise from the consciousness of mutual membership. His conception of the Temple as built on the foundation of apostles and prophets (while Paul would have admitted Christ only), and of the new universalism (which Paul, having learned it directly from Christ, held, like Athanasius, *contra*

mundum) being in this age revealed for the first time to "holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit" is perhaps the most striking of all his departures from the manner and accent of Paul. In Paul the moral struggle is with the flesh, but here it is with external agencies of evil. In Paul peace is a name of a deep inward tranquillity, here it describes a relationship of man to man and a condition of the Church's unity. In Paul the new life pertains to the human spirit regenerate, but here there is nothing corresponding save the characteristic subtlety in the expression the "spirit of your mind." In Paul the conception of the body of the individual as a temple and as destined to be quickened by the inhabiting Spirit shows a far more vivid realisation of the Divine presence in human life and in the work of salvation than does anything expressed in this Epistle. But the divergence is that of a mind fertile and fruitful; and the lesson of the divergence is the richness and comprehensiveness of the faith that was delivered to the saints. Here also is Christianity, expounded by a man of wide-eyed intellect and fine literary culture, whose humanism has not stained his clear vision of the holiness and grace of God, and who expects a Church united, pure, and strong, because it is the Church of the living God whose strength is infinite and whose gift is peace.

Much might be said in correction of misconceptions. For example, it is vain to read the moral exhortations as marking some special local temporary uprise of error. The exhortation to

holiness and purity is practically the same in 1 Thess. 4, in 1 Pet. 1, in Rom. $12^{1.2}$ and in Eph. 4, and it simply marks the everlasting antagonism of a pure Christianity and a polluted paganism. And again, the appeals towards unity and strength (which here are parallel to the exhortations to faith and patience and steadfast endurance, in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*) set forth the very conditions of existence in that age of persecution and unbelief. We have not dwelt on the conceptions of truth (or of the truth), intellectual and moral; or the kindred ideas of the heavenly, and the perfect and the absolute; or of the numerous terms that set forth religion and life in the language of knowledge ($1^{8.17.18}$ $3^{4.5.9.10.18}$ 4^{13}). They prove nothing of locality. They bear the far-reaching shadow of Plato, and were familiar in the widely diffused systems of thought and education that belonged to the Greek-speaking world, and were therefore Attic or Asiatic as well as Alexandrian. They simply show that this apostle of the new faith, when in his ardent youth events called him to Greece or Ephesus, did not disdain to learn the best language and the highest thought of the peoples he felt summoned to enlighten. Rather did he make it his endeavour to bring the best treasures of their minds into captivity to the law and service of Christ. Finally, the Epistle has for us to-day its still living message. And when we see men peering betwixt its sacred lines to discover that Paul at last rose from his embarrassing doctrines of the spirit to the sacred heights of a new social sacerdotalism, is it not incumbent on

expositors to aid the earnest investigations of these inquiring brethren? In the sixteenth century the pretensions of Rome were nobly answered in the expositions both of the one holy invisible Church and of the Church visible in its doctrine, worship, government, and life. The teaching of Calvin is much "higher" than the doctrine of this Epistle, which once only (and that formally) mentions Baptism, and nowhere alludes to the Eucharist; and which commits the edifying of the Church, or the "building up of the body" to prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, men whose qualifications are in their faith and fitness and spiritual ardour. This Epistle is concerned with the foundation and the walls, not the pinnacles or ornaments. Let our brethren beware lest, repeating the error of Rome, they plant the pyramid on its apex, whereon only an unsubstantial structure can have sufficient lightness to stand. Here in *Ephesians*, where the doctrine of the Church is at its highest, they will find no mention of bishop or other earthly head, no priests or processions or paraphernalia of worship, but only spiritual access; no elevation or geographic direction, or "mystery" from the ages of darkness. But instead of these they will find, in conceptions of the exalted Lord, of the greatness and destiny of man, of the unity of faith and hope and knowledge, of the kinship and harmony of races, thoughts that enlarge and uplift the mind, that gladden and inspire the heart; and for general guidance the old unchanging truth—"by grace are ye saved, through faith, not of works, for we are

His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works."

The First Epistle of Peter

First Peter has generally been regarded as, in substance or tendency, a Pauline Epistle. But perhaps this judgment is due to that vaguer conception of Paulinism which arose from including in it Ephesians, Hebrews, and the Pastorals. In any case the relation to *Ephesians* is sufficiently close to suggest unity of authorship. In subsequent chapters it will be shown that all the second group have substantially the same theology, the same ethics, and the same literary characteristics. Here some of the closer points of connection with Ephesians will be given.

The Epistle is divided into sections (1–2^{10}, 2^{11}–4^{11}, 4^{12}–5^{14}), the first being doctrinal, the second practical. It is true that the handling in Ephesians is more symmetrical, and that here there is a third section, dealing more specially with questions or needs of the hour; so that the arrangement is more closely allied to what we have in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Still, the resemblance is close, and the practical part is here also described as exhortation. The divisions are marked by the term "beloved," which may have been characteristic of Peter. The first division begins exactly as Ephesians (both following 2 Corinthians), "Blessed be the God and Father of . . ." who hath variously blessed us. Both emphasise election and the Christian hope. Both are in the style of weighty, lengthened, and

long-drawn-out sentence. In Peter there is the strongest assertion anywhere of the doctrine of the Church as a spiritual house or temple for the honouring of God. Yet the term Church, so prominent in the same line of thought of Ephesians, has not yet been appropriated to the new Israel. In both there is the doctrine of redemption, and in both salvation is attributed to the word (1 Pet. 1^{23}, Eph. 1^{13}). In the second division both of Ephesians and of 1 Peter we have, with more or less of detail, specific duties, such as those of king and subject, master and servant, husband and wife. This point also establishes a connection between the Epistles; and towards the close both describe the Devil as the adversary of man.

It is true that 1 Peter is a much simpler Epistle, with a less developed theology, with less imagination and intellectual effort; and on the other hand, with more of plain practical duty. Thus the compound word "doing good" occurs in one form or other half a dozen times ($2^{15.\ 20}$ $3^{6.\ 17}$ 2^{14} 4^{19}), reminding us of the speech Acts 10^{34-43}, and a similar emphasis is laid on "the will of God." Yet not only familiar but also unexpected doctrines belong to both. In both Christ's life is set forth as our example, though in 1 Peter with more emphasis in respect of persecution. In both there is the descent into Hades (1 Pet. 3^{19} 4^{6}, Eph. 4^{9}). In both Christ is exalted to the right hand of God, and above the principalities. In both also, apparently, the risen Christ preaches, in the one

case to the spirits in prison (1 Pet. 3^{19}), in the other through apostles to men (Eph. 2^{17}). In both also Christ preaches through the prophets of old, though the full meaning remained until now a mystery (1 Pet. 1^{11}, Eph. 3^{5}). The pre-existence of Christ with God is apparently assumed in both (1 Pet. 1^{20}, Eph. 1^{4}).

There are also unusual terms common to both. Such are "ignorance," descriptive of the past life; children of obedience compared with sons of disobedience, the phrase "watch *unto* prayer," the metaphors of girding the loins and of moral life as warfare. More remarkable than these are the new conceptions borne by familiar words, such as faith, hope, obedience, truth, the emphasis on *ἀναστροφή* (cf. Eph. 2^{3} 4^{22}), on the purifying word ($1^{22.\,23}$, cf. Eph. 5^{26}), the distinct idea of *προσαγωγή* (1 Pet. 3^{18}, cf. Eph. 2^{18} 3^{12}) as the aim of Christ's death, the purifying of the soul and obtaining of life through the word or the truth ($1^{22.\,23}$), and the general ethical system. Here, as in Ephesians, "good works" are the end of life, but they are never the ground of acceptance (1 Pet. 3^{9}, Eph. 2^{10}). The will of God and the example of Christ are the guiding things of life. The end to which these point, the end for which Christ died and for which He brings men to God, is that they may live unto righteousness, and in that righteous life manifest all the graces of the Christian spirit. This moral life, with the ethical results of the Atonement, finds far bolder and grander expression in Ephesians, where the writer, with more freedom or fuller

mastery, gives us his maturest utterance (Eph. 4. 5); but essentially the teaching of both is one.

Some sentences in 1 Peter seem individual; especially perhaps "whom having not seen ye love, whom . . . believing ye rejoice." Yet with this we may compare Eph. $1^{12.\ 13}$, "we who had before hoped in Christ; in whom ye also . . . having also believed were sealed with the Holy Spirit"; and with the rejoicing of "making melody with your heart" (5^{19}). The rather far-fetched reference to baptism (1 Pet. 3^{21}) may be compared with Eph. 5^{26} in two points, in the introduction of the Resurrection of Christ and in the separating of the efficacy from the rite.

Points of connection with Rom. 12 occur in the reference to spiritual sacrifices (2^{5}), the exercise of gifts ($4^{10.\ 11}$), and phrases such as "rendering evil for evil" (3^{9}, Rom. 12^{17}, 1 Thess. 5^{15}). Other connections with 1 Thess. 4 and Rom. 13 and with Matthew will be noted; and indeed no characteristic of the second group will be found entirely wanting. There is indeed less appearance of literary power, yet this may be due not so much to immaturity as to deliberate restraint.

The Epistle to the Hebrews

The Epistle to the Hebrews is a study in itself, and it is no longer intimately associated with Paul. Its authorship has with great plausibility been assigned to Barnabas and to Apollos. In common with the former, the writer was a hearer of the

apostles (2^3), and a man of Levitical training; in common with the latter, he had a knowledge of Græco-Jewish literature and a gift of eloquence; unlike either, he was an associate of Timothy. There is also perhaps a connection with Luke, and a considerable element of Paulinism.

In general form it is (like the others of the second group) an Epistle of exhortation. But as Ephesians enlarges on the conception of the Church and the duty of union amongst all Christians, so this Epistle bases itself on Christianity as the consummation of Judaism and on the duty of steadfast adherence to the final form of revelation. It is (like 1 Peter) in three parts: an introduction (1, 2) setting forth the Person of Christ in His Divinity and full humanity; then the main argument (3–10^{18}); and finally, the closing appeal, with its historic and ideal inspirations (10^{19}–13^{25}). The leading argument is in two main parts: the first, closing with the seventh chapter, on the High Priesthood of Christ (which includes His eternal life, His moral perfection, His propitiation and His intercession, $7^{16.\ 24}$ 7^{26} 2^{17} 7^{25}); the second, on the "better covenant." It is to be noted that while in 1 Peter, Christ is called the "Pastor and Bishop of souls," He is here the "Apostle and High Priest of our confession"; and the human experience of Christ (as known to the Jews) is dwelt on not as an example for us, but as having fitted Him to be sympathetic and merciful. The resemblance, not in detail but in mental conception, is manifest. The Epistles are also linked by many striking ex-

pressions. The second part deals with the Death by which the covenant was sealed. Christ is the offering, voluntary, spotless, and of eternal significance; and by this offering He sanctifies and perfects the sanctified (9^{14} $10^{10.\ 14}$). He is the sacrifice by which He made purification for, bore and put away, sins, and after which He sat down for ever on the right hand (1^{3} $9^{26.\ 28}$ 10^{12}). From this follow the remission of sins, the cleansing of the conscience, the free access to God and the future expectation ($9^{12.\ 14}$, $10^{17.\ 19-22}$ 9^{28}).

The points are not numerous, and most of them arise, like bubbling fountains, in the exhortation in Ephesians. There also Christ is an "offering and sacrifice," voluntary, efficacious (5^{2}). There by the blood He brings us nigh, preaching peace and giving access to the Father; bringing the redemption which includes the remission of trespasses ($2^{13.\ 17.\ 18.}$ 1^{7}). There also He cleanses and sanctifies, creating a Church glorious, spotless, holy ($5^{26.\ 27}$). The doctrines are identical. In *Hebrews* we have them thought out in succession and in detail; in Ephesians they well up, more concentrated, from the fulness of an overflowing mind.

The closing section is (as always) moral exhortation: to the various Christian duties, and especially to firmness in faith,—for the day of testing and of judgment cometh. But Christ the great Pastor is alive; and God is the Perfecter who will work in His people His holy will ($13^{21.\ 22}$).

This Epistle therefore stands midway between 1 Peter and Ephesians, preserving the simpler ethics of the former, still emphasising the life and example of Christ, still finding duty in goodness and the will of God, still regarding sacred things with reverence and awe. But at the same time it presents a far richer theology, in its deeper conception of the New Covenant, its more varied presentation of the Atonement, and in its realisation of Christianity as a heavenly system of which the Old Covenant was but a copy or shadow. And it expresses a fuller consciousness of the benefits of Christianity in respect of fellowship with God, united worship, and social Christian life. From this exponent of the final religion and of the means of grace afforded in united worship and brotherly regard we might well expect that conception of the universality and unity of the Church which when writing to the Gentiles the author of *Ephesians* so eloquently unfolds.

Another Epistle closely allied to the second group—intimately touching Ephesians and 1 Peter on the one side and 2 Thess. 1, 2 on the other—is the Epistle of Jude. Here the apocalyptic elements predominate; but there are also the Trinitarian presentation (vers. 20, 21, an undoubted mark of connection), the defilement of the flesh (2 Cor. 7^1), and reminiscences of 1 Timothy and James. But to discuss whether this Epistle is by the same author, or is the work of a disciple and kindred spirit, is to enter on a task outside the purpose of this volume.

CHAPTER VII

OTHER WRITINGS OF THE SECOND GROUP

1. 1 *and* 2 *Thessalonians*

THE Epistles to the Thessalonians constitute a new problem. They differ from all others. If there are epistolary elements, they are vague and trivial; no burning questions of life and practice, no persons named or plans disclosed, nothing (as in 1 Corinthians) to bring before us a living picture of a church or age. And on the doctrinal side there is, in any definite sense, only one theme. Whether that theme (the Second Coming) was at any time a thing of ardent and general expectation; and, if so, when and where and in what historic circumstance, is a problem for the solution of which the evidence may be insufficient. And whether the passages regarding it could have been written by Paul is a separate and serious question. The unenlightened mind accepts whatever comes; but the critic must pause to consider whether a Pharisaic rabbi could also be an enthusiastic apocalyptist. In this case, therefore, questions of authorship and date are vital to the full appreciation of the Epistles.

Ethical exhortations and general handling of common doctrine may be made at any time. Our present initial question is whether these Epistles, with their picture of idlers in the church, and the urgent catastrophic prophecies, were really written by Paul at the commencement of his ministry in Europe.

The first thing noticeable is the entire absence of every Pauline characteristic; Paul's garden was not like Tennyson's: though many had the seed none other could sow it and grow it. And (is it accordingly?) there are here no forensic doctrines, no background of law, no mysticism or life in Christ, no indwelling and in-testifying Spirit, no reference to the Cross, historic, doctrinal, or ethic, no transfiguration of the body of the future into the likeness of Christ. Such terms as "reconciliation," "the righteousness of God," "justification," "the spirit of adoption" are conspicuously absent. Absent also are the ethics of crucifixion to the world or of death to sin, and of the love of God or the grace of charity as filling the heart and enlarging the soul. Absent, too, is the personality of the author: the spiritual struggles, the rich affections, the unresting labours, the unveiled spirit, the agitated life of trial and ardour that belonged to the Apostle of the Gentiles.

But, says our friendly expositor with sweet unconcern: all this is quite intelligible, omissions are now known to mean nothing; the Epistles depend on the controversies of the hour, or the limited purpose of the occasion; Paul's life re-

sembles the successive compartments of a railway train. But alas! the omissions are not so much of doctrines as of mind and heart and personality. This mode of argument hardly calls forth argument. It makes sport of reason. *Incredulus odi.*

Apart from negative evidences there are *prima facie* positive evidences that we are in a new region of thought. The phrase near the beginning, "your faith to Godward," may indeed be reckoned conclusive; for Paul was not a commonplace preacher of religion, but an apostle of CHRIST. That God (1 Thess. 1^{8}) is not *our* Father, but *the* Father (1^{1}). And what shall we say of the apocalyptic portions which contain the *motif* of the Epistles? We have known the apostle as a student of the law and the prophets, through which he passed from Gamaliel to Christ. His mind was early steeped in Pharisaic lore; his first discourse of which there is any record speaks of the law and justification (Acts 13^{39}), and at the last he is still a Pharisee attached to the ancient law and assured of the double resurrection ($24^{14.\ 15}$). In what lucid interval did he turn to Enoch and the apocalyptists to learn a gospel of which neither in the *Acts* nor in the Five Epistles is there any sure trace? These Epistles contain the ordinary conceptions of death and resurrection and judgment; they foresee long vistas of human history in which the Gentiles, and again the Jews, will be won by the preaching of the gospel to the faith of Christ.

The arguments from literary style are equally strong. Let us take the most obvious point. Paul's

mind was antithetic, and his statements are brief, pointed, and lucid, always full of reality. Here a great part is devoid of distinction; but again, we have such a sentence as 2 Thess. 1^{3-10}, where, each rising from the preceding, we have a magnificent succession of clauses, culminating in an impressive and startling climax. Nowhere in these chapters do we recognise the presence of the *man*, Paul.

Again, we find that the theory that these letters were written from Corinth in the first year of the gospel in Europe involves impossibilities of date. In the First Epistle we find (1) a Christian brotherhood spread over all Macedonia, animated by a general knowledge and love (4^{10}); (2) the existence of regular ecclesiastical organisation shown in the definite formation of a Church (not a mere company of believers, but a Church in God) (1^{1}), in distinction from "those without," so that already the believers are marked off from the rest of the community (4^{12}), and in the existence of a stated ministry—a ministry of manifold function in respect of government, instruction, and admonition ($5^{12.\ 13}$); (3) anxiety regarding the Christian dead, of whom the number must have been considerable. [This anxiety was apparently not due to the mere fact of death, for the doctrines of forgiveness and eternal life must have been part of their fundamental belief; but rather to an unfulfilled expectation which we do not know of Paul's having ever held forth in his preaching.] (4) The growth of evils in the community, not merely the habits of immorality that abounded in these cities (4^{3-7}), but special vices of

troublesomeness in connection with the life of the Church, such as a few weeks' or months' existence could scarcely have brought into view ($4^{11.\ 12}$). These evils reappear in the Second Epistle in a rather more pronounced form, especially in respect of disorder, idling, and meddlesomeness (2 Thess. 3^{6-12}). Let whoever chooses believe that these things sprang up, and were known at apostolic headquarters to exist, in the first and persecuted days of the great new evangel. Here let us further remark on the prevailing opinion that the disorderliness and idleness resulted from an expectation of the immediate Coming of the Lord. A strange effect it would surely be from such a cause. As a matter of fact, the vices reproved in Thessalonica are the vices that appear, after the first fervour, in every mission field. Even at the present day the majority of mankind are idlers. The capacity of prolonged labour indicates a stage of development that can be reached only after centuries of discipline. The Athenians are humorously painted in Acts 17^{21}; and often it would be the most restless that would most readily receive a new faith. Hence the idler and the busy-body were things of course. But it is contrary to analogy and probability that such things should exist, should stand forth for observation and criticism, and should be dealt with in the language of dictatorial reproof, all in the first springtide of the proclamation of the gospel. The supposition of an immediately widespread Christianity—with such incidental defects made prominent, and a regular ministry unable to con-

trol the turbulent—requires an unusual kind of faith.

These Epistles, in fact, require intelligent investigation; and at the outset we observe that they are written in the joint names of Paul, Silas, and Timothy. They do not claim to be entirely the direct work of the apostle. And the opinion that the two younger names are added conventionally may be itself a conventional error. It is possible that either the second or the third may be the main author, or that the Epistles are a joint product, or that Paul's name may be purely honorary, indicating the school from which the documents proceed. Looking more minutely, we discover that both Epistles have in the middle a complete break. The prayers (1 Thess. 3^{11-13}, 2 Thess. $2^{16.17}$) are of the kind that mark conclusions. It is true that something similar occurs in the middle of Ephesians, where the doctrinal part ceases. And therefore (although here we have not, as there, a systematic arrangement of doctrinal and ethical parts) we must not hurriedly draw inferences. But we seem also to recognise a marked divergence of style between the two parts of each. The points are numerous. Enough for the present that one is a powerful ethical preacher, the other much quieter and simpler; that one is steeped in the O.T., of which the other makes perhaps no original use; and again, that the former boldly handles the Apocalypse, which the latter only touches externally. That there may be a revision of the whole by one of the writers we do not doubt, but on the three grounds

stated we feel justified in proceeding to examine the parts separately, recognising 1 Thess. 4. 5, 2 Thess. 1. 2 as the work of one author (Silas?), and 1 Thess. 1–3, 2 Thess. 3 as the accompanying contribution of another (Timothy?). At present we do not discuss whether the parts were put together jointly, or whether the younger man did not at a later stage incorporate with additions of his own two earlier messages of his colleague.

The parts 1 Thess. 4. 5, 2 Thess. 1–3 leave no doubt of their affinities. The opening verses (1 Thess. 4^{1-12}) are in the style of 1 Peter in the general purpose of exhortation, and in the special appeals for purity of life, love of the brethren, and quiet, humble usefulness. The terminology also is to the same effect. Such an instance as the extraordinary term "vessel," with the association of "honour" (4^4, 1 Pet. 3^7), is alone conclusive either of common authorship or of imitation. To the same effect are "this is the will of God" (4^3, 1 Pet. 2^{15} 3^{17}), "your sanctification" (4^3, 1 Pet. 1^{14-16} 2^{11}). But the connection with Ephesians in respect of "walk," "pleasing God," "sanctification" ($4^{1.3}$) is equally manifest; and, in short, we have the style of moral pleading and exhortation which belongs to the whole second group. The same thing is true of chap. 5. In its ethical appeal we have the figures of night and day, light and darkness, sleep and waking, drunkenness and sobriety, which have all their parallels. The striking summary 6^{14-22} is in the manner of Rom. 12. On the theological side we have the concep-

tion of salvation as future and eschatological (5^{9}), this differing both from Paul and from Luke, but characteristic of the whole group; and the description of Christ's death as for our life, after the manner of 1 Pet. 2^{24}, and the "God of peace," perfecting after the manner of Heb. $13^{20.\ 21}$. The ecclesiastical situation corresponds (5^{12}, cf. Heb. 13^{7}, Rom. 12^{8}; the same term being used in 1 Tim. $3^{4.\ 5.\ 12}$ 5^{17}, but not in the earlier Pastorals). The trichotomy of 5^{23} is paralleled in Heb. 4^{12}. The easy mastery of exhortation, and of the art of expounding social and personal duty, puts these two chapters on a level with the three chief Epistles of our second group.

The other two chapters (2 Thess. 1. 2) are mainly apocalyptic; but the closing verses ($2^{13.\ 14}$) show us where we are. "Sanctification of the Spirit" (2 Thess. 2^{13}, 1 Pet. 1^{2}) is an indubitable connection; "salvation" (eschatological) belongs to the group. The phrases "faith of the truth" and "acquirement of the glory" point in the same direction, the former indicating that "the truth" is taking the place of the Person; the latter being equivalent to 1 Pet. 5^{10}, while περιποίησις occurs elsewhere only in this group (1 Pet. 2^{9}, Eph. 1^{14}, 1 Thess. 5^{9}, 2 Thess. 2^{14}, and Heb. 10^{39}). Other terms are "chose" (here a Lucan word; Phil. 1^{22}, Heb. 11^{25}), loved us (cf. Eph. 2^{4}), good hope (cf. 1 Pet. 1^{3}, Heb. 7^{19}), comfort, stablish, good work. Besides these there are notable new phrases —working of error, love of the truth, faith of the truth, deceit of unrighteousness—that remind us of

similar expressions, especially in Ephesians, and show the active creative vigour of an ardent and powerful mind. Many of them emphasise this new idea of "the truth." We find it begun in the Pastorals, where, however, the standard expression is "the faith." It implies that the object of Christian faith is no longer (as in Paul) either a historic fact such as the Resurrection, or a Person to whom they joyfully surrendered, but the general conceptions of God's government, grace, and purpose as revealed in Christ and recognised as the Christian system. Christianity is the truth; its denial (the fruit of a working of error) is a lie. We are already in sight of the writings of John.

Let us now pass to the main subject of these Epistles, the imminent expectation of the Parousia. The return of Christ was undoubtedly an idea of early Christianity. But between the original expectations and the more definite conceptions of the Parousia and the Millennium there is a period of growth which may not be easily traced. Christian faith is magnificently expressed in the angelic message in Acts 1^{11}, and Jesus Himself seems to have portrayed the Coming as something visible in the clouds. The general conception, as indicated in the Synoptics and in Paul, is of Christ's coming at the close of the existing era to judge mankind. Whether it was to be soon or late is by no means clear. The future was hidden from the apostles, as our future is from us. Within it, in the distance, loomed the day of Christ. But both in Gospels

and in Epistles we have glimpses of a long development and a gradually expanding era. It may be that Paul wavered on the subject, and that in such a phrase as "the quick and the dead" we may read an anticipation of an early event. Amongst the many that came into the Church, this anticipation would be blended with the myths and superstitions of paganism. On the other hand, in a deeply spiritual mind like John's the judgment itself is spiritualised. Neither the Parousia nor the Millennium is, strictly speaking, a primitive idea. The former term occurs only in 1 and 2 Thessalonians, and in Matt. 24^3 and 1 Cor. 15^{23} (all, as we suppose, from one source), and in James (once) and 2 Peter, which derives from Matthew (frequently). It does not belong, therefore, to the Synoptics or to Paul (the single insertion in Matt. 24 and 1 Cor. 15 being editorial) or to Luke. It may have pertained to a limited circle and a limited epoch.

It is also instructive to notice an indication of the time of the expected occurrence. Tell us (says Mark, referring to the destruction of Jerusalem), "when shall these things be, and what shall be the sign" thereof. Tell us (says Matthew, prefacing the same discourse), "when shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of Thy Coming and of the end of the world" (Mark 13^4, Matt. 24^3). In this last writer's mind the national disaster and the expected Parousia and the final Consummation are all events blended together as if successive stages of one great Dispensation. And is it not possible that the expectation of an early Coming took

definite shape under the excitement of the political catastrophe? The use of *παρουσία* in Matt. 24^3 may be the first technical application of the term. Certain it is that no text in the five Epistles of Paul bears the weight of meaning usually assigned to the apostle. The "day" of which he writes so solemnly at the beginning of 1 Corinthians and Philippians, what is it but the close of life and the judgment thereafter? Or again, "we groan, . . . waiting for the adoption,"—what is that but another note in the "still sad music of humanity" which for ten thousand years has rolled across our world; a note not personal but human, multitudinous, universal?

But in 1 and 2 Thessalonians there is something new. Not something personal, spiritual, subjective; not the inworking Spirit of God, transforming mortal bodies, but an objective phenomenon, a cataclysm of space and time, arresting the eye of sense, and in its fulfilment closing the record of history. Now, the first noticeable fact is that the Epistles are dependent on the discourse in Matthew. Compare the following passages referring to the "day of the Lord"—

1 Thess. 5^2	=	Matt. 24^{43}	As a thief.
„ 5^3	=	„ 24^8	Travail.
„ 5^4	=	„ $24^{44.45}$	Sons of light, wise, etc.
„ 5^{2-5}	=	„ 24^{36}	Time unknown.
„ 5^6	=	„ $24^{42}\ 25^{13}$	Watch.

With more direct reference to the personal Parousia compare

1 Thess. $4^{16.17}$ = Matt. $24^{30.31}$

in both of which we have the descent, the angels

(or archangel), the imagery of clouds, and the blowing of the trumpet. With the Second Epistle the connection or parallelism is no less marked. Compare

2 Thess. 2^{1}	= in	Matt. 24^{31}	Gathering together.
„ 2^{2}	=	„ 24^{6}	Mental trouble.
„ 2^{3}	=	„ 24^{12}	Prevalence of iniquity.
„ 2^{4}	=	„ 24^{15}	Sacrilegious abomination.
„ $2^{8.9}$	=	„ 24^{24}	Antichrist.
„ 2^{9}	=	„ 24^{24}	Signs and wonders.
„ $2^{10.11}$	=	„ $24^{11.24}$	Deception.

We have also in the preceding chapter points of connection: the accompaniment of angels (1 Thess. 1^{7} = Matt. 24^{31}), power and flaming fire = power and great glory (1^{7} 24^{31}), and the note of affliction or vengeance ($1^{6.8}$ 24^{19-21}).

We have thus given about twenty instances of connection or dependence. The fact is, of course, not denied. Rather is it welcomed as a proof that Paul had access to the sayings of Christ. And it is not necessary to relate the Epistles to Matthew. The same sayings occur in Mark; most of them in Luke. But the sayings in Mark and Matthew took their present form at the crisis of 70 A.D. This is shown by the parenthesis of warning (Mark 13^{14}, Matt. 24^{15}), and by the reference in the same sentence to the defilement of the Temple. Is it not this defilement that is pictured in 2 Thess. 2^{4}? Let this point be noted and examined. For if the supposition be true we need no other evidence that the Thessalonian Epistles lie outside the life of Paul. In concluding this point we observe that at least two phrases in 2 Thessalonians indicate dependence

on the Pastorals—the phrase "mystery of iniquity," which corresponds to mystery of godliness (2 Tim. 3^{16}) or of the faith (3^{9}, cf. 2 Thess. 2^{7}), and the term ἐπιφάνεια in connection with the Parousia (2 Thess. 2^{8}, cf. 2 Tim. $4^{1.8}$, 1 Tim. 6^{14}, Tit. 2^{13}). In the case of the phrase "sanctification of the Spirit," it is impossible to judge which of the two (1 Peter or Thessalonians) is prior.

Another point on the surface concerns Luke. If he who made his narrative of the Supper correspond exactly to the words of 1 Cor. 11 had known 1 Thessalonians as a letter of Paul's he would not have committed the blunder of turning a "thief" into a "snare" (Luke 21^{34}). Nor would he have been likely to omit the train of angels and the gathering together of the elect of God. As a matter of fact, the eschatological discourse, as given both in Matthew and in Mark, has been shaped by one who enlarged the recorded fragments of Christ's prophecy regarding Jerusalem with details of the Parousia derived from apocalyptic Scriptures. Between the one event and the other Luke inserts the times of the "Gentiles" (21^{24}) foreshadowed in Rom. 11^{25}. But to the first two Gospels, and to the Thessalonian Epistles, these times are already all but accomplished.

Let us now look briefly at the other half (1 Thess. 1–3, 2 Thess. 3). Here we have something of the nature of epistolary correspondence, though without sufficient indication of purpose. Whether as letters or as dissertations these chapters are colourless. Some slight historical difficulties are raised.

The statement in 1 Thess. 3^1, that Paul sent Timothy from Athens to Thessalonica could not be inferred from *Acts*, and would seem not to have been known to Luke. Again, both parts inform us that Paul, when in Thessalonica, laboured at his secular occupation; and they assume for the apostle a length of stay in that city and an intimate interest in its Church such as, again, could hardly have been known to the author of the *Acts*. Here, however, the Epistles are partially confirmed by Phil. 4^{15}. But from these slight instances we infer that the Epistles (which we supposed subsequent to *Luke*) are also subsequent to the publication of *Acts*.

In another chapter we endeavour to show that 1 Thess. 1–3 is largely dependent on Philippians, and in a smaller degree on 2 Corinthians. The fact is conclusive against Pauline authorship; but as both these Epistles were known to Timothy, who is named as joint-author, it tells in favour of the claim on his behalf.

Another evidence against the Pauline and in favour of the Timothean authorship is in the anti-Jewish attitude. Let us read the indictment (1 Thess. $2^{15.16}$)—

"Who killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets,
And drave out us,
And please not God,
And are contrary to all men. . . .
The wrath is come upon them to the uttermost."

Are these the words of the man who was ready to be accursed from Christ for the Jews' sake? Or could

Paul have drawn the first two parallel lines; or any of these lines? The judgment that says so is judged. But the sting of this scorpionic sentence is in its tail. The wrath is come upon them, εἰς τέλος. Here is a problem for the man who makes 1 Thessalonians the earliest of N.T. writings. What is the event that, in defiance and reversal of their hopes, has come upon them, and is at once a fulfilment of prophecy and a revelation of judgment (so the words "come" and "wrath" imply); and has been carried into effect to the utmost possibility? Was it not in the year 70 A.D., in fire and blood, that this τέλος of heavenly wrath was realised and accomplished?

Allied to this is the evidence of O.T. quotation. Let us look at the two parts, and at the striking contrast they afford. In 1 Thess. 4. 5 there are (according to Westcott and Hort) six or seven quotations, and in 2 Thess. 1. 2 about twice as many. They are representative of the whole O.T., being taken from the Pentateuch, the greater prophets (including Daniel), the Psalms and Job. This is a considerable number when we note that there is about an equal number of references to sayings of Christ. But a specially acute critic has found in one passage (2 Thess. 1^{6-10}) no less than thirty Scriptural references (see in Dr. Kennedy's *Cunningham Lectures*, pp. 48, 49). The latter half of the great sentence with which the Epistle opens is an elaborate mosaic of O.T. appropriation and reminiscence. And again, it is pointed out that in the next chapter 2 Thess. 2^4 is not merely derived

from one passage in Daniel, but is allied to several. We thus see that the writer's mind was steeped in the Jewish Scriptures, and that his conception of the Parousia took shape from his interpretation of prophetic and apocalyptic literature.

When we turn to the other half the result is equally striking. In 2 Thess. 3 there is no O.T. reference. In 1 Thess. 1–3 there seem to be two. The phrase "proveth our hearts" (2^4) belongs to Jeremiah and Ps. 7^9 and Prov. 17^3, but is already expressed in Rom. 8^{27}. The phrase "fill up their sins" (2^{16}) is traced to Gen. 15^{16}; but a similar sentiment occurs in Matt. 23^{32} (cf. Dan. 8^{32} LXX). It is possible, therefore, or probable, that the words were familiar, being frequently on the lips of the Christian evangelists.

Now, we say with confidence that neither the one manner nor the other is that of Paul. He makes abundant use of the O.T. But he does so as an independent thinker who illustrates his thoughts from the patriarchs or the prophets. (In his five Epistles he has no quotation from Daniel, and little if any from Ezekiel or Leviticus.) Our second writer, the apocalyptist, is a literary artist to whom the O.T. affords the material both of thought and of expression. He follows while Paul masters the ancient word. Our third writer, the denouncer of the Jews, makes little use of, though he may have knowledge of, their sacred books.

On the general question of literary style, to which we have slightly referred, the contrast of

the two is marked, and both are far removed from the pointed manner of Paul. Our third writer, whose mind is imitative rather than original, writes with clearness and ease; but he has no heights or depths and (in these Epistles at least) no obscurities or surprises. But his companion, the apocalyptist, is a great man of letters. He may not be, like Paul, an original thinker and master. He does not touch the heart or sway the intellect as the apostle does. He is too encased in clerical dignity and too prone to literary artifice. But he is nevertheless bold and powerful in thought, impassioned and eloquent in utterance. Two manners, quite opposite and equally remarkable, belong to him: the long sentence rising clause out of clause like some lofty tree or tower where the successive portions are clearly defined (as in 2 Thess. 1^{3-10}, cf. Eph. 1^{3-14} 4^{11-16}, 1 Pet. 1^{3-12}, Heb. 1); and the telling sequence of short sentences that rapidly descend like hammer strokes (1 Thess. 5^{13-22}, cf. Rom. 12, Heb. 13, 1 Pet. 5). He has the sense of progressive movement, of proportion and symmetry, of climax and cadence, and the love of alliterative sound.

That the writers were Silas and Timothy is suggested by the commencement, and is in accordance with internal probability. Silas was a Jew prominent in Jerusalem, and possessed of the reputation of a prophet. Quite likely his prophetic gift showed itself both in moral exhortation and in apocalyptic warning. But Timothy was the son of a Greek father, and was reared in a distant

province; and his experiences of Jewish persecution would have sufficed to turn the scale of his sympathies. It may be added that this theory of authorship leaves ample room for explanation of the relationship between the Epistles and the Acts. They agree in their account of the reception which the preachers received from the Jews. It is also alleged that there is a similarity of style (suggesting dependence) between them and Acts 17. Baur supposed that the Epistles were based on the Acts; and indeed the opposite view, that Luke followed the Epistles, is scarcely tenable, except on the theory of a carelessness which did not take note of such things as Timothy's presence in Athens. But while Baur is right in denying the priority in time of the Epistles, it is manifest that Timothy did not need to go to any one for the facts. Luke's omissions are explained if we suppose that he did not accompany the party beyond Philippi. Any similarity of style may be due to the fact that the styles of Luke and Timothy were naturally similar; though it is also possible that there was an official diary known to them all.

The Epistles must be dated between 70 and 80 A.D. The second was perhaps written a few years after the first, when it seemed necessary to modify the impression of an immediate manifestation of Christ. The trend of coming events is now conceived afresh. Not until a far completer empire of evil and of blasphemy shall challenge the supremacy of God will the heavens be opened

and the Son with His chariots of fire (as before in the pre-mundane strife) issue forth to hurl the powers of Satan a second time into the bottomless abyss (2 Thess. 2^{6-12}). It is, however, a possible theory that the apocalyptic parts were written by Silas about 70, and that the Epistles were completed and edited by Timothy when their chief author was no more.

2. *Special Passages*

In both of the Corinthian Epistles we find a paragraph or passage in the style of the apocalyptist, which therefore, according to our tests, must be eliminated from the work of Paul. The first is 1 Cor. 15^{20-35}, and it is the only instance of an interpolation used to enlarge an argument. We find here a description of God, ὁ θεός καὶ πατήρ (ver. 24), which in the same form occurs elsewhere only in Eph. 5^{20} (and in James). So also we find a subordination and final subjection of the Son to the Father which is not suggested by the theology of Paul, but which is perhaps in accordance with the idea of Eph. 5^{5}. The argument of the passage is based on two Old Testament texts, neither of which is elsewhere referred to by Paul: Ps. 110, so quoted in the Synoptics, in Heb. 1^{13} 10^{13} and in 1 Pet. 3^{22}; and Ps. 8^{6}, again discussed in Heb. 2^{8}, Eph. 1^{22}. Thus we are in the element of the three kindred Epistles. Further, the reference to death as the last enemy to be abolished reminds us in thought and language of Heb. 2^{14} (cf. 2 Tim. 1^{10}, where the

application is to what has been accomplished). Again, we have the term Parousia (ver. 23), nowhere else used of the Christ in the Epistles we have assigned to Paul. The description of Christ as the first-fruits (ver. 23) (Paul's πρωτότοκος) is widely different from Paul's use of ἀπαρχή (foretaste), but it is similar to the use of the term in 2 Thess. 2^{13} (if that be the correct reading) and in the kindred Epistle of James. Besides παρουσία we have ἐξουσία (ver. 24), nowhere used by Paul concretely; but in the second group, as here employed, to denote the spiritual hierarchies. This whole mode of thought regarding powers and personifications of evil, while it is characteristic of the second group (and of Colossians), is foreign to the thought of Paul (or Luke). The use of the term "asleep" for dead is confined to the second group (1 Thess. 4 and Matt. 27^{52}), except for the phrase "asleep in Christ" (ver. 18). The repeated use of "all," and especially of the phrase "all in all" (cf. Eph. 1^{23}), points in the same direction. It has been supposed that there are minute points of correspondence between this passage and Matt. 24, from which the inference has been wrongly drawn that Paul knew the First Gospel. Doubtless the actual writer did.

The following verses (29–34) are of a different kind. Of the baptisms going on for the dead we know nothing, but may be allowed to doubt if the practice had begun at Corinth when Paul wrote (*i.e.* within three years of the first preaching, and under authoritative guidance). Our argument

takes from Paul his fight with beasts (which, however, took place after 1 Corinthians was written), his dying daily, which may recall 2 Cor. 4 or secular parallels, and his disappointing alternative (ver. 23, cf. Isa 22^{13}). The phrase "be not deceived," which has already occurred in this Epistle (6^{9}), and is in Galatians and in James, may therefore be due to any one. The words that follow are a quotation substantially found in Menander, but anciently said to be from Euripides. From Euripides came the phrase "I have fought a good fight," which we attributed to Luke. Perhaps such verses were commonplaces of Greek education. The exhortation "awake righteously" is in the recognised manner of the group, and has closest affinities with 1 Peter; and "sin not" is a repetition of Eph. 4^{26} (Ps. 4^{4}). The term *agnosia*, no knowledge, (derived from Wisdom), appears elsewhere only in 1 Pet. 2^{15}. For kinship of thought we may compare Eph. 2^{12} 4^{18}, 1 Thess. 4^{5}, 2 Thess. 1^{8} (and in Paul, Rom. 1^{22}, Gal. 4^{8}). The closing words, "I speak to move you to shame," are repeated somewhat artificially from 1 Cor. 6^{5}, from which context also came the repetition in the preceding sentence. The expression "Christ Jesus our Lord" reads heavily in a chapter where the single name "Christ" has been used twelve times in as many successive verses.

In the whole of this passage there is scarcely one genuine mark of Paul. It undoubtedly belongs to the second group. Yet, as in all the

second group, there are many words suggestive of Luke. Besides the Greek quotation we note *κινδυνεύω, ἔκτος δῆλον δίκαιως, ἄχρις οὗ ἀν.* Such terms suggest an intimate association of the younger men.

Similarly, from the Second Epistle to the Corinthians we must mark off the paragraph 6^{14}–7^{1}. These six verses break the connection and are therefore an interpolation. They are written for a definite purpose, to forbid intermarriages with the heathen, and must owe their place to accident. Of elements that are non-Pauline and characteristic of the second group, they contain (1) the manner of exhortation and ethical appeal; (2) the ethical use of righteousness; (3) the contrast of light and darkness; (4) the priestly language of defilement and cleansing; (5) the aims of holiness and fear (1 Pet. 1^{15-17}); (6) the conception of the Christians as God's people, *λαός* (1 Pet. 2^{10}); (7) the transference of the metaphor of the Temple from the individual to the community (as in 1 Peter, Ephesians); (8) the epithet *πίστος* (1 Pet. 1^{21}, Eph. 1^{1}); (9) the phrase "living God," rare in Paul, frequent in Hebrews; (10) the term *ἀνομία*, once in Paul, frequent in Matthew, Hebrews; and here as in 2 Thessalonians (11) the name Beliar for the Prince of evil, for whom the second group has many names; (12) the phrase defilement of the spirit—a non-Pauline idea, in accordance with 1 Thess. 5^{23}. To these twelve definite reasons many more could be added: the general tone and atmosphere of the passage, quite different from what belongs to the sharp clear intellect of

Paul; the extraordinary mosaic of O.T. quotation in verses 17, 18 (in which Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, Leviticus, and 2 Samuel are drawn on), and many individual words, some of which, such as, "unequally yoked" (based on Leviticus), or μολυσμός naturally belong to the second group, while others, as συγκατάθεσις, συμφώνησις, ἐπιτελέω, are more like the words of Luke. But from beginning to end the traces of Paul are such as only the blind can clearly see! It may, however, be held that the use of the term παντοκράτωρ is a strong argument for assigning the passage to the author of the Apocalypse.

Once more, let us consider the chapters Rom. 12–15. As we turn the page after Rom. 11 we suddenly find ourselves in a new world. We pass from the freshness and force of an original creative thinker into a high clerical atmosphere and the language of lofty commonplace. All is changed. The first word is semi-technical, revealing the voice of one to whom has been committed the ministry of exhortation. There in bold strokes life is pictured for us, in the language of the priesthood, as a sacrifice and a liturgical service of religion. We remember that Paul was a Pharisee whose ideal was righteousness. But the present writer is Levitical, and his ideal is the holy, acceptable, and perfect will of God. This accords with Heb. 7^{5} 13^{16}; but the will of God and the adjective λογικός, and the word "fashioned according to this world," connect us with 1 Pet. (1^{5} $2^{2.5}$

4^{2} etc.); while yet again the "renewing of your mind" seems a variant of Eph. 4^{23}, and a connection with Eph. 5^{10} is established by the words and idiom, "proving what is well-pleasing." To these main points we have to add that the epithets "holy-living," "perfect" and "well-pleasing," are characteristic of the second group, and rare in Paul.

Thus we have here the whole case in miniature. And we are sure that the writer is either the author of the three Epistles (Ephesians, Hebrews, 1 Peter), or one whose mind was steeped in the thought and language of them all. Again, we notice the dependence on, as well as the remoteness from, Paul. Thoughts in him are germinal. And what in him is natural and general becomes special and stereotyped and ethical or religious. Thus *σχῆμα* (1 Cor. 7^{31}, Phil. 2^{8}) and *μετασχηματίζω* (4) are used by him without any gloomy suggestion. But here (and in 1 Pet. 1^{14}) *συσχηματίζω* bears upon it the shadow of a fallen and doomed existence. Similarly *μεταμορφόω* and *ἀνα καίνωσις* (2 Cor. 3^{18}, cf. 4^{6}), which in Paul have what may be called an ontological meaning, have here (and in Hebrews) a purely ethical significance. And yet again one is compelled to ask whether these terms of Greek literature—*ἀνακαινίζω*, *μετασχηματίζω*, *μεταμορφόω*—are originally Paul's or Luke's.

In ver. 3 the length of the sentence, the common-place maxim, and the use of "faith" are non-Pauline. The sentiment of sobriety is in 1 Pet. 4^{7}, the phrase "grace given to me" occurs three

times in Ephesians, but is used by Paul himself (1 Cor. 3^{10}, Gal. 2^{9}); of his work, however, and not as here of teaching. Verses 4, 5 contain Paul's figure of the body and its members, but with a difference; for here we are members "one of another" as in Eph. 4^{25}, not "members thereof" as in 1 Cor. 12^{27}. Moreover, the expression "one body" accords with Eph. 4^{4}, and is probably used not locally as in Paul, but of the whole Christian world; so that here already we have advanced beyond the conception of self-governing communities to the conception of the Church as a whole. Verses 6–8 expound the gifts or charisms and afford material for observation. The charisms are not (as in Paul) attributed to the Spirit—they are human talents. Five of the most remarkable in 1 Corinthians are omitted, namely, healing, miracles, tongues, interpretations, discerning of spirits; and not only these but wisdom, knowledge, faith. Instead of these appear new gifts: ministering (as in 1 Pet. 4^{11}), teaching (cf. Eph. $4^{11.\ 14}$ and the Pastorals), exhorting (as in Heb. 13^{22}, 1 Pet. 5^{13}, etc.), ruling (as in 1 Thess. 5^{12}), also liberality (as in Eph. 4^{28}), and showing mercy (Matt. 5^{7}). This sentence sums up a history of transition. The ecstatic gifts have ceased, and indeed, except prophecy, all the higher qualities of creative inspiration. Instead of these we have the utilities of everyday existence in an organised community. The vision splendid is past, having faded into the light of common day. We have, in short, the language of settled Christianity. Let it be added

that this passage is later than the Pastorals. The gifts of teaching, exhorting, and ruling are found there, but not the last two (which are paralleled in Ephesians and Matthew), and perhaps not *διακονία* in its acquired technical sense (cf. 1 Tim. 1^{12}).

The remainder of the chapter is occupied with a collection of moral maxims from Proverbs and the Psalms, from Christ, from Paul himself, and in one case perhaps from Acts (steadfastly in prayer; but cf. Col. 4^{2}). The virtue of "brotherliness," *φιλαδελφία*, is distinctive of the second group. Hospitality (Heb. 13^{2}, 1 Pet. 4^{9}) has passed into it from the Pastorals. The passage as a whole has its nearest parallel in 1 Thess. 5. A notable point is that in ver. 19 (which contains the non-Pauline designation "beloved") there is a misquotation from Deut. 32^{35}, which appears in the same form in Heb. 10^{30}. This accident is not an accidental coincidence. It virtually proves either community of authorship or dependence. But we need not dwell on particular points. This mode of teaching by groups of apophthegms is not Paul's. Pioneers and founders are not perfecters of phrases or artificers of quotations. Paul dived to deeper principles, described Christian life in comprehensive words that went to the root or source of things; for to him morality was God in man.

Chapter 13 is a new section. Verses 1–7, enjoining submission to recognised institutions, is fuller than the parallel passage, 1 Pet. 2^{13-17}, and not clearly dependent; rather do they appear to be the work of one mind acting in different circum-

stances of time and place. In both the good purpose or aim of government is set forth. Obedience is enjoined, in the one case for conscience sake (13^{5}), in the other for the Lord's sake (1 Pet. 2^{13}); but even this distinction seems harmonised in a later sentence (1 Pet. 2^{19}). The most notable difference is that in Romans governments are traced to God, while in 1 Peter they are simply human institutions. But the two aspects are not necessarily contradictory. Verse 7 is a reminiscence of words of Christ, showing that the editor knew the Gospels. Of terminology the phrase "every soul" comes from Leviticus, and, though occurring in Acts 2^{43} 3^{23}, is probably non-Lucan. Paul's "every soul of man" (Rom. 2^{9}) has its counterpart in Num. $31^{40.\,46}$. The term good, *ἀγαθός*, in vers. 3, 4 and in $12^{2.\,9.\,21}$, is a mark of connection with 1 Peter, which has the idea equally often.

The verses on love (8–10, cf. Gal. 5^{14}) accord with the Synoptic record as given in Matt. $22^{39.\,40}$. Matthew's observation "on these two commandments hang . . .," which is exactly the point here, is not found in the parallels. And when we further remember that the preceding verse (7) is an echo of Matt. 22^{21} (or its parallels), the connection with the First Gospel becomes practically certain. We observe also that the word "comprehended" (or summed up) occurs again only in Eph. 1^{10}; the Pauline or Lucan term is "fulfilled."

The remaining verses (11–14) have numerous points of vital connection with our second group.

The chief are : *σωτηρία*, eschatological (1 Pet. $1^{5\text{-}10}$, Heb. 9^{28}, 1 Thess. $5^{8.9}$, 2 Thess. 2^{13}, Eph. 1^{13}?) ; sleep and awaking (Ephesians, 1 Thessalonians) ; night and day, light and darkness (Ephesians, 1 Peter, 1 Thessalonians) ; "the works of darkness" (Eph. 5^{11}) ; the armour (Eph. 6, 1 Thess.) ; the provision for the flesh (1 Pet. $4^{2.3}$) ; the putting on of a higher nature (Eph. 4^{24}, cf. Gal. 3^{27}). Of the list of vices two pairs occur in Gal. $5^{20.21}$, and seem quoted. Other terms are time and season (1 Thess. 5^{1}), "walk" as a designation of life (Eph. 5), believed (Eph. 1^{13}, Heb. 4^{3}, 2 Thess. 1^{10}). It seems not too much to say that of these three verses every thought and suggestion and almost every word reappear in Eph. 5. 6, 1 Thess. 5, or in 1 Peter and Hebrews. In addition we have noted a slight connection with Galatians. The last two sentences, indeed, constitute a difficulty. The phrase "walk honestly" is distinctly of the Lucan type, but it appears also in 1 Thess. 4^{12}. What follows is also Lucan, though here derived from Galatians ; and the term "provision" occurs elsewhere only in Acts. How this Lucan influence has come in is a problem for the subtle critic.

We have at least proved, first, that these two chapters have no connection with the thought or pen of Paul ; and second, that they are intimately connected with Hebrews, 1 Peter, Ephesians, 1 Thess. 5, and Matthew ; there are also quotations from other sources. Whether they are written by the author of the second group, or by a later compiler whose mind was saturated with these Epistles, is a problem for discussion. Whether, again, they were written for

this Epistle to the Romans or were originally a separate compilation we cannot know. Their place here is clearly due to a desire to make the master Epistle more completely serviceable to the Church as a handbook of Christian doctrine and life.

Chapters 14, 15, 16, must be regarded as detached additions, separate from the preceding and from each other. Chapter 14 is Pauline in spirit, and it follows 1 Corinthians both in sentiments and in the frequency with which Christ is called Lord. It is a Pauline manifesto on a burning question of early Christian times. In form it is stanzaic and semi-poetic, each thought being expressed in three clauses. It may perhaps be a translation. The words "all things are clean" are characteristic of Luke, occurring as here in Tit. 1^{1} and more fully in Luke 11^{41}. But the idea is equally characteristic of Mark 7, and there are in the same connection points of agreement with Colossians. The use of κοινός (Mark, Hebrews) seems non-Lucan (contrast Acts 2^{44}, Tit. 1^{4}). No use is made of the O.T., except in one quotation already given in Philippians, and here not quite accurately remembered. This would correspond with either Timothy or Luke. The description of the Kingdom of God as a moral social order (ver. 17) is its most original statement, showing perhaps Greek influence or a form of Christianity tinged with ideas of the Stoic philosophy. It is perhaps reconcilable with Col. 1^{13}. The concluding phrase "joy in the Holy Ghost" is a reminder of 1 Thess. 1^{6}. Next to this the most notable

sentence is ver. 9, "Christ died and lived in order to be Lord of dead and living." This form of sentence began with Paul (as in Gal. $4^{4.5}$, where Christ passed under the law to redeem man "under the law"). It is more frequent in the second group, where Christ fills all things in order to save all things (Eph. 4^{10}, Heb. 2^{17}, 1 Thess. 5^{10}). And if we understand this sentence to include the descent into Hades, the connection with or derivation from the second group becomes obvious. But in style there is no connection. The judgment-bar of God (not Christ) seems to distinguish the writer from Luke; and the same seems true of the "Kingdom of God." The metaphorical use of *οἰκοδομή*, edification (ver. 19), belongs both to the first and to the second group, but is not Lucan. It may be said briefly that in thought the chapter agrees both with Paul and with the second group; in style both with Luke and with Timothy; and that of these the only one who could have been the author was Timothy.

Chapter 15 is unmistakably the writing of a Jew. The reference to Christ as a minister of the circumcision (ver. 8), and the frequent quotations from the O.T., are sufficient proof thereof. The writer is also related to the priesthood, as may be inferred from verse 16, with its sacerdotal terms, *ἱερογοῦντα*, *προσφορά*, and less clearly *λειτουργόν*, *ἡγιασμενή*. These points refer us back to the author of the second group, and we find over again the same descriptions of God (5. 6), the same conceptions of the Holy Ghost (13. 16), the same

manner of quotation, the same terminology. What is new, as God of hope, follows analogy. Amongst the terms we notice *οἰκοδομή*, as in Ephesians and Corinthians ; *εἰς το ἀγαθόν*, as in 13^4 ; *τὸ αὐτον φρονεῖν*, as in 12^{16} ; "grace given to me," as in 12^6 ; *ἀγαθωσύνη*, as in Eph. 5^9, 2 Thess. 1^{11}. Again, in the closing verses (30–33) the style of the second group is still more manifest. See, *e.g.*, beseech by, co-strive, signs and wonders (Heb. 2^4), delivered (*ῥυσθῶ*), disobedient, acceptable, will of God, rest, God of peace. Stronger evidence than these is the inweaving in verse 30 of the triune aspect, or name, of God. This, together with the conception implied in "love of the Spirit," is to us conclusive. But it is still open to doubt whether the entire chapter is from the writer's mind. In the middle the style is not so obvious ; and it is not impossible that some part, especially that relating to the contribution (25–28) is in the very words of Paul. It seems a reasonable supposition that Paul's own closing words are incorporated in this expanded peroration. We wish to know whether the reference to Illyricum has the exactness of meaning which pertains to the words if they possess Paul's full authority. And still more do we wish to solve the problem of history and biography which the reference to Spain and the statement in Clement have created. But to disentangle the original apostolic nucleus will remain an uncertain task.

Of chapter 16 the personal part (1–16 and again 21–24) may be confidently accepted as Paul's. The personal touches, and some terms, as *ψυχῆς*

(ver. 4) are strong evidence. But again, verses 17–20 are a manifest interpolation. They contain words of the second group, *παρακαλῶ δε, εἰς το ἀγαθόν*, God of peace. There are points of connection with Philippians, and points in the style of Luke. One antithetic sentence is a modification of Christ's saying, Matt. 10^{16}; another sentence is based on the prophecy in Gen. 3^{15}. The imitative elements seem to throw the balance of probability in favour of the Timothean authorship.

The doxology (16^{26-28}) is almost certainly Luke's. The form of the sentence follows 1 Tim. 1^{17} ("Now unto . . . "), and is constructed as Tit. 1^{1-4}. The words *χρόνοις αἰωνίοις, κατ' ἐπιταγήν, κήρυγμα, μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ, φανερωθέντος* are in the Pastoral style; as also mystery, scriptures, the faith, my Gospel, and perhaps others. In the phrase "times eternal" we have the words of two of the Pastorals, but the idiom (Dat.) of Luke 8^{29}. The phrase "obedience to the faith" unites the passage with 1^{5}, and also reminds us of Acts 7^{7}, "were obedient to the faith." If the theory of the Lucan authorship of the Pastorals is correct it follows that this doxology is also from the pen of Luke.

3. *The Gospel according to Matthew*

The problem of the Synoptic Gospels has been minutely studied for two generations, and on many important points there is now substantial agreement. But, so far as I know, the relations of these biographies to the contemporary Epistles has

not been fruitfully investigated. In my opinion not only are they contemporary, but the Gospels in their present shape must be attributed to writers of Epistles, or at least the first three Gospels must be intimately related to our second, third, and fourth groups. In this section we call attention to the connection of the second group with Matthew.

Not with Matthew as a whole. That Gospel is of course composite. It contains two main parts—(1) a narrative of events which is common to the three Synoptics, and of which Mark may be regarded as a later and slightly enlarged edition; (2) a collection of sayings of Christ (such as was anciently attributed to Matthew the Apostle), which has been diversely rendered and arranged in the First and Third Gospels. But besides these there are incidents and sayings otherwise obtained. And over all is the colouring due to the final editor or author. In this last element will be found the theology, the ethics, the literary method, the general characteristics of the author of the second group.

The problem is exceedingly complicated, and the final solution may not be near, but many points of connection can be clearly exhibited. One or two examples will show how individuality asserts itself. The sentence Matt. 10^{26} occurs in the three Synoptics in such a way as to suggest different renderings of a Semitic original. The three forms may be read side by side.

Matt. 10^{26}: "There is nothing covered, that

shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known."

Mark. 4^{22}: "There is nothing hid, save that it should be manifested; neither was anything made secret, but that it should come to light."

Luke 8^{17}: "Nothing is hid, that shall not be made manifest; nor anything secret, that shall not be known and come to light."

In this case Mark and Luke virtually agree. They place the saying after the parable of the Sower, and they give substantially the same words, Luke being more paraphrastic. But Matthew places the saying differently and gives a distinct rendering. Further, his term "revealed" is characteristic of the second group, and "known" is suggestive of the same connection. Instead of these Mark has "manifested" (*φανερωθῇ*) and "come into light" (*εἰς φανερόν*). This verb, which is again prominent in the closing verses of Mark, occurs three times in Colossians (1^{26} 3^4 4^4). It occurs also in each of the three Epistles, 1 Peter (twice), Ephesians, Hebrews; but in these, terms of knowledge and revelation are frequent. Again, the term *ἀπόκρυφος*, secret, used in Mark and Luke, occurs in the Epistles only in Col. 2^3. Here, then, we have a suggestion of a connection of Ephesians and Colossians with Matthew and Mark respectively. Again, take the parable of the Sower. Here the enemy of the soul appears in Matthew as *ὁ πονηρός*, in Mark as Satan, and in Luke as the Devil. This distinction corresponds to our general position, as elsewhere shown. Mark probably gives the term of the Teacher, which was also

the term of Paul. In Luke we notice the terms "honest," "patience" (*καλός*, *ὑπομονή*), which remind us of the Pastorals. Again, in the clause regarding cares and riches we have ample materials for comparison, reflection, and suggestion. Luke's language again accords with the Pastorals, especially *ἡδοναὶ* and *βιοῦ*; Matthew's with the second group, as in *ἀπάτη*, *αἰών*. Mark agrees with Matthew in phraseology, with Luke in the triplicity; and the question of interdependence and priority is not easily settled.

These instances show that passages common to two or three of the Gospels may be studied for the discovery, not only of their mutual relations, but also of their relation to the thought and language of the first century in so far as these are known.

Confining ourselves now to the First Gospel, we shall endeavour to show that the final editor thereof and the author who has impressed on it its distinctive character is no other than the man whom we have just studied as the interpreter both of Peter and of Paul. Arguments to this effect may be distinguished as general and special. Under the former we may include style, doctrine, and moral teaching.

As regards style, we note the method of systematic grouping as distinct from chronological sequence. The author's idea is quite different from Luke's as described in that writer's preface. His mind is not analytic but sympathetic, his instinct is not historical but ethical, his arrangement is with a view to practical effect. And such method

harmonises with the divisions and exhortations of the second group.

First, we observe the sayings of Christ mainly gathered in five chapters or collections formed with a general correspondence in time and subject-matter. The Sermon on the Mount contains Christ's fundamental moral teaching. Chapter 10 contains instructions or directions to Christian workers. Chapter 13 in a succession of parables sketches the progress of the Kingdom. Chapter 18 gives what may be called ecclesiastical direction. Chapter 23 is a counterpart to the Beatitudes: denunciation and sorrow for the privileged who have failed in duty. Chapters 24, 25 are eschatological and final. Besides these, there are shorter passages given in their historic contents. Whether the groups are five or six or seven may be open to discussion. Of subdivisions the most notable "sevens" are the Beatitudes, the parables of the Kingdom, the sections of the Law (6, 7), the woes (23). Perhaps also there are groups of three, as in the Temptation, or the first set of Miracles (chap. 8).

In all this we see the manner of a man who is less a historian than a moralist, less concerned with chronological sequence or outward detail than with didactic method and effective result.

Let us see, further, how in this Gospel the most important ecclesiastical doctrines are enshrined.

Take the doctrine of the Atonement. The First Gospel is distinguished from the other two in its connecting the forgiveness of sins with the

Death of Christ. In 26^{28} we have the addition, not given in the parallel narratives, "unto remission of sins." This use of ἄφεσις is frequent in Luke, but nowhere in connection with the Death or the Blood of Christ. Its connection with the Blood is confined to Eph. 1^{7}, Heb. 9. 10, and Matthew. Doubtless it is implied in the parallel Synoptics in Col. 1^{14}, and more certainly in 1 Pet. 1^{18}, cf. Acts 20^{28}.

The statement in 1^{21}, He "shall save His people from their sins," points in the same direction, and has an additional connection with the second group in the use of the term λαός. Cf. Eph. 2^{5}, where salvation is from trespasses.

In Matt. 20^{28} (parallel with Mark 10^{45}) we have the equally notable phrase, "a ransom for many." The giving here must mean the giving of the life; and (as in the second group) the giving is attributed to Christ, not (as in Paul or John) to God. But here we have one of the places where Matthew and Mark agree, while Luke takes a different course; and the question arises, which of the two is prior, and whether that prior one has not followed another unknown source? The less usual preposition ἀντι belongs in this sense almost exclusively to the second group (Matt. 5^{38} 17^{27}, Eph. 5^{31}, Heb. $12^{2.\ 16}$, and the thrice repeated phrase "evil for evil"). It is therefore at least possible that the final editor of Mark has copied this page from the final Matthew.

The same question of priority may be raised regarding the phrase (Matt. 26^{28} = Mark 14^{24}) "my

blood of the covenant." This phrase occurs in substance repeatedly in Hebrews. And we saw in the case of the parable of the Sower that the priority of the final Mark is by no means certain. Other passages suggest the same doubt. And possibly it will yet be proved that the Gospels, as we have them, appeared in the following order — Luke, Matthew, Mark.

Take next the Person of Christ, and therewith the conception of God. Christ is the Son of God not merely in a Messianic sense, or in passages common to the Synoptics, as 3^{17} 17^{5} 26^{64}, but most emphatically as in 16^{16} 28^{19}. About twenty times God is called "His Father"; and the shorter form "the Father" appears in 11^{27} 24^{36} 28^{19}, or simply "Father," $11^{25.\ 26}$. This latter passage belongs to Luke also, but many of the texts are confined to Matthew (7^{21} $10^{32.\ 33}$ 15^{13} 16^{17} $18^{10.\ 19.\ 35}$ 25^{34} $26^{29.\ 53}$ 28^{19}). In several of these we see the common narrative revised by a writer in full sympathy with the author of Ephesians. In some cases the distinction is in definiteness, as in 24^{36}, where "my Father" takes the place of "the Father" in Mark. But again in 26^{29} "my Father" corresponds to "God" in Mark; and so also in Luke (12^{8} 22^{18}) though the majority of the texts are wanting, and in other cases the Divine name is not given. The general effect, as far as theology is concerned, is to place the First Gospel apart from the Second and Third and alongside of the Fourth. Again, the closing text 28^{19} points more distinctly than any other in the N.T. to the doctrine of the Trinity; and

therein (as we elsewhere show) has its affinities with the second group.

No less remarkable is the form "your Father," occurring in Matthew at least seventeen times, always in the discourses or sayings as revised in the First Gospel, and scarcely to be found in the other Synoptics. Matt. $6^{14.\ 15}$ and 18^{35} contain a saying which appears also in Mark 11^{25} (cf. Eph. 4^{32}), but cannot have belonged to the original Mark. Matthew has "your" and "my" heavenly Father, while Mark has "your Father who is in heaven," —a form which seems to have passed as a superfluity from the First Gospel into the Second. This is one of several passages that suggest that the latest edition of Mark is later than Matthew.

The doctrine of the Church universal, which is explicit in Ephesians and implicit in 1 Peter and Hebrews, is emphatically stated in $16^{18.\ 19}$. There is also the metaphor of building, as in Eph. $2^{20.\ 22}$, 1 Pet. 2^{5}, Acts 20^{32}. Two other statements belong to Matthew: the strength of the Church surpassing that of the Kingdom of Hades, which, however, is to be expected of the city of the living God (Heb. 12^{22}); and the nomination of Peter as a foundation-stone. This reminds us of Eph. 2^{20}, where "apostles and prophets" are the foundation, a divergence that might be regarded as a natural expansion if the author was writing to readers that had not directly known Peter. In Eph. 2^{20}, 1 Pet. 2^{6}, Christ is the chief corner-stone (cf. Isa. 28^{16}). This is based on a saying of Christ common to the three Synoptics, but given with varying fulness, where Mark shortens

and Matthew enlarges the original narrative here seen in Luke. Christ's Headship over the Church and also (as in Ephesians, 1 Peter) over the angelic powers is in substance asserted in Matt. 28^{18}.

There is also (especially in chap. 18) a more ecclesiastical atmosphere than in the other Gospels.

The presence of Christ with His people (18^{20} 28^{20}) is similarly implied in Heb. $13^{5.\ 6.\ 8}$, cf. Acts 18^{10}. This is parallel to passages in the Old Testament, especially in the Prophets, where the presence of Jehovah with His people is assumed.

The Parousia or Coming of Christ, which connects this Gospel with 1 and 2 Thessalonians, is more frequent and emphatic in Matthew than in the others. The texts 10^{23} 23^{39} are not in Mark or Luke. In 16^{28} the personal Coming takes the place of the "Kingdom of God" in Mark 9^{1}. In chapter 24 the details are more full than elsewhere. The descriptions of Christ as Judge ($7^{22.\ 23}$ 13^{41} 16^{27} 25^{31-46}) support the same view, as does also the term *συντέλεια* (13^{40} 28^{20}, cf. Heb. 9^{26}). And there are many points of connection between chapter 24 and the apocalyptic passages in the Thessalonian Epistles.

Another general argument is found in the use of the terms "heavenly," "in the heavens." Such expressions seem used both in the literal or local and in a figurative or ethical sense. Both senses will be found in Matthew, Ephesians, and Hebrews. The latter is the more distinctive and suggestive.

In Matthew the "Kingdom of God" is transformed into the "Kingdom of the heavens." (In

$21^{31.\ 43}$ the more general expression occurs twice in sayings not elsewhere found in the same form; so also 6^{33}.) Here the argument rather tells against us, as the phrase (Kingdom of heaven) does not re-appear in the second group or elsewhere. But neither does our author, except once (2 Thess. 1^{5}), use the expression "Kingdom of God." And the texts Heb. 12^{28}, Eph. 5^{5}, 1 Cor. 15^{24} point to an unusual conception. In 1 Cor. 15^{24} and in Heb. 12^{28} we have simply Kingdom (without God), and with this may be compared the "gospel of the Kingdom," which occurs thrice in Matt. 4^{23} 9^{35} 24^{14}, and "the Kingdom prepared . . ." (25^{34}). The Kingdom is also directly connected with the "Father" (13^{43} 26^{29}). The phrase "who art in Heaven" occurs in Matthew ten times, and the epithet "the heavenly" or "heavenly" (*οὐράνιος*) nearly as often. The heavens (or heaven, Matt. 6^{20}, 1 Pet. 1^{12} 3^{21}) are prominent in the second group as the place or region to which Christ has gone. But at least in Eph. 2^{6} 1^{3} the heavenlies (*τα ἐπουράνια*) denotes the region of grace or privilege in which Christians already find themselves (while in 1^{20} 3^{10} it is used of Christ and supernatural beings). It is natural to compare this metaphoric and twofold usage with such texts as Matt. $5^{3.\ 10}$, where the Kingdom seems to denote a spiritual present possession. In Hebrews this adjective (*ἐπουράνιος*) occurs six times as descriptive of the heavenly Kingdom or temple. In both the main Epistles of the second group this epithet seems to be employed as indicative of the absolute character of Christianity. There is a certain differ-

ence of usage between the two Epistles, and a still greater difference between them and Matthew; yet these difficulties are not insurmountable. The adjective *ἐπουράνιος* is Paul's (Phil. 2^{10}, 1 Cor. $15^{40.\,48}$), and may well have passed from him into other Epistles. To him probably belongs also the phrase "the heavenly Kingdom" (2 Tim. 4^{18}), whence Heb. 11^{16} 12^{22}, and perhaps the phraseology of Matthew. The influence of Paul appears also in Heb. 3^{1}. In him, therefore, we may perhaps find the key to the whole of this particular question. What pertains to our present argument is the use of the plural (heavens), the phrases "who art in Heaven," and "Kingdom of heaven," and the antithesis of heaven and earth. The epithet *οὐράνιος* is possibly from a different source.

Let us now, chiefly with a view to ethical teaching, take a succession of texts peculiar to Matthew.

1. In the account of the Baptism we have the words "fulfil all (manner of) righteousness" (3^{15}). Here several points emerge. "Righteousness" is used in the personal, not the Messianic sense, as in 5^{20} 6^{1}, and in the second group. The wide reference here, including all ceremonial observance, is such as might be expected in a writer of priestly training. The epithet "all" is also characteristic of the second group, and perhaps a result of its hortatory and rhetorical manner. Here we may compare Eph. 5^{9}, also Phil. $5^{9\text{f}}$. The term "fulfil," with its kindred terms "full," "fulness" (*πληρόω*, *πλήρης*, *πλήρωμα*), are more frequent and notable in the second group than elsewhere. With this passage

compare 2 Thess. 1^{11}, Rom. 13^{8} 15^{19}. Finally, we may here find two distinctive ideas of the second group: the conceptions of purification and consecration (Eph. 5^{26}), and the view of Christ's life as an example.

2. Take next the Beatitudes. Poverty of spirit and meekness reappear in the image of Christ (11^{29}), and are combined in Eph. 4^{2} (cf. Zech. 9^{9}). Equally striking is the resemblance of Luke's Beatitudes to the anti-love-of-riches attitude of the Pastorals. Whether the simple sense of Luke or the spiritualised interpretation of Matthew is truer to the original we need not here inquire. Purity or cleansing, *καθαρός*, is characteristic of the second group, and the reward of "seeing God" reappears in Heb. 12^{12}. The purifying of the heart also belongs to Hebrews (10^{22}), and comes perhaps from the same pen in Acts 15^{9} (cf. 1 Tim. 1^{5}, 2 Tim. 2^{22}). The phrase "in spirit" or "in the spirit" is also characteristic (Eph. 2^{22} 3^{5} 5^{18} 6^{18}), though not in such passages, but rather in 1 Pet. 3^{4}, we get again the idea of 5^{3}. The description of peacemakers as "Sons of God" corresponds with the description "God of Peace" and with the social meaning which "peace" bears in the second group. The blessedness of the persecuted reappears (with "for righteousness sake") in 1 Pet. 3^{14}, and in a modified form in 1 Pet. $4^{13.\ 14}$.

In the verses that follow (14–16), the phrases "light of the world," "good works," and "glorify your Father" accord with the second group. With the last two compare again 1 Pet. 2^{12}, where the

connection is certain; also $4^{11.16}$. The exposition of moral law leads up to the virtue of perfection (5^{48}), so characteristic of Hebrews and Ephesians.

The three modes of righteousness with which chapter 6 begins illustrate the spirituality of religion.

In the Lord's Prayer are two petitions not given in Luke. In the first of these we have the contrast of heaven and earth,—heaven as the ideal-real or the perfect pattern, and the will of God (that good and holy and acceptable and perfect will) as the standard. In the other we have the dark term *πονηροῦ*, used in this group of the Prince of evil, and also the idiom *ἀπό* instead of *ἐκ*, which distinguishes the second from the other three groups.

In the second half of chapter 6 we have what seems the language of a different translator; but again in chapter 7, especially in vers. 11–23, we have the former author. Notable are the terms *πονηρός*, *ἀγαθός*, *ἀνομία*, "the Kingdom of heaven," "the will of My Father who is in heaven." In the narrative of chapter 8 the order in Mark is departed from to give precedence to the cleansing of the leper. This miracle may have seemed symbolical of Christ's work of soul-healing. The second is typical of the second aspect of Christ's work, its universality; and to make this emphatic the sayings ($8^{11.12}$) given in Luke in another connection are here incorporated. Thus the central ideas of Hebrews and Ephesians may be found suggested by these two miracles. In the third a distinctive note is seen in the name Peter (instead

of Simon) which this writer uses (instead of Paul's Cephas).

In 9^{13}, and again in 12^{7}, we have the saying quoted from prophecy, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," which accords with Heb. 10^{5-8}, and the exhortations to spiritual sacrifice. We have remarked on vers. 23 and 26 in chapter 10. Perhaps in ver. 8, "cleanse the lepers, raise the dead," we have indications of the writer's theology. The maxim in ver. 16 is remembered in Eph. 5^{15} and Rom. 16^{19}. In 37, 38, "worthy of" is characteristic of the second group. The language of 10^{8}, 11^{5} is of course derived from prophecy (cf. Luke 7^{19-23}).

In the gracious invitation 11^{28-30} we note Christ exhibited as an example; the figure of the yoke, elsewhere only in Acts 15^{10}, and the spiritual boon of rest (so Hebrews, 2 Thess. 1^{6}, Rom. 15).

In 12^{28-32} the spirit is emphasised more than in the parallel narratives, taking the place, in accordance with O.T. ideas, of Luke's "finger." Peculiar to Matthew also is the contrast of this and the coming age; cf. Eph. 1^{21}. The closing sentence (v. 50) again makes the will of God the supreme law (so Mark, not Luke).

In 13 we have the group of parables. The *Sower* has been referred to. The sentiment appended in ver. 17, expressing the forward look of men of old, reappears in 1 Pet. $1^{10.11}$, Heb. 11^{13}. The *Tares* is distinctive of Matthew. Here we have both *πονηρός* and *διάβολος*, and he is styled enemy; cf. adversary, 1 Pet. 5^{8}, Eph. 6^{11-16}. Here also the term *συντέλεια*, elsewhere in

Hebrews; cf. 1 Pet. 4^{7}, 1 Cor. 15^{34}. And here *ἀνομία*, in a quotation from Zephaniah and Ezekiel, all savouring of the second group. The closing sentence (v. 43) is a quotation from Daniel, the prophet of apocalyptists. The quotation in v. 35 (Ps. 78^{2}) contains the expression "the foundation" (of the world), which we have more fully in vv. 25, 34, and in 1 Peter and Ephesians. Again, in the parable of the *Net* we have *συντέλεια*, and the angels as Christ's ministers separating the good and the bad, destroying the worthless; cf. 1 Thess. 4^{16}, 2 Thess. 1^{7-9}.

In chapter 14^{28-32} there is a Petrine incident not found elsewhere. So also 16^{17-19} and 17^{24-27}. This Gospel is not more favourable to Peter than the others, but it gives him a more prominent position.

In the Cæsarea-Philippi scene we have in the common material the unexpected name of Jeremiah, and the stronger confession of Peter. The additional verses contain much that belongs to the second group; spiritual revelation, the church, a building, the antithesis of earth and heaven.

Chapter 18 must be largely derived from an unknown source. The little ones, and their angels, and the two or three gathered together, are in a new style. Yet here we have again the will of God, as in Eph. 1^{5}; church discipline "at the mouth of two or three witnesses," appears again in Heb. 10^{28}, but seems taken from Paul (2 Cor. 13^{1}), who follows Deuteronomy. Again, 18^{18}, on binding and loosing

(already given in 16^{19}), is another renewal of a Jewish principle, and may have been omitted in the Second and Third Gospels, from the failure of the authors thereof to comprehend its meaning; while 18^{33} is a sentiment repeated in Eph. 5^{32}.

In the story of the young man (19^{16-22}) Matthew inserts the word "perfect" and cancels the verb "inherit," both of which accord with our second group. In ver. 28 we have the unusual term *παλιγγενεσία*, or national regeneration, which is another expression of the eschatological idea.

The parable in chapter 20 teaches the sovereignty of God, an emphatic principle of Ephesians and 1 Peter. The contrast of evil and good in ver. 15 is frequent in the group.

On the whole the latter chapters (except 24, elsewhere examined) have little bearing on our purpose; we have already referred to the texts 20^{28} 26^{28} $28^{18.\ 19}$. Such a phrase as "in the Spirit" (22^{43}), or the use of "true" and "truth" (22^{16}), or the description of Christ as Master (23^{10}, cf. Eph. 6^{9}, though the terms corresponding to the contexts are widely different), is suggestive of the second group. So also are the epithets "living" (26^{63} and 16^{16}), "holy" (25^{31} 27^{53}), and "stranger" (25^{35}). But in 19–23 there is not one text certainly allied to the second group.

The picture of the final judgment is in general harmony. It contains the characteristic conception, "from the foundation of the world." The "Kingdom" is in the sense we find in Eph. 5^{5}

(1 Cor. 15^{24}), Heb. 12^{28}, and as in Ephesians we have the idea of inheritance (which we found modified when the substantive was "life," 19^{17} 25^{46}). There are also the frequent figure of the shepherd and the sheep, the conception of glory, the description of followers as brethren (40, cf. Heb. 2^{12}), and the great merit of ministering (cf. Heb. 6^{10}). The parables, in the same chapter, of the Virgins and the Talents at least accord with frequent exhortation in the group. The chapters that follow add little to the narrative in Mark. We have noted 26^{28} 27^{53}.

Different styles and phraseology can be traced in this Gospel. Thus, though rarely, we have "Kingdom of God," and its inserter seems to prefer "Pharisees" to "scribes" ($21^{43.45}$, cf. 21^{15}). Again, instead of "in the heavens" we have half a dozen times "heavenly." But the questions whether these passages containing *οὐράνιος*, or those containing the "Kingdom of God," are to be regarded as an unrevised original, or a variation of the author's manner, or a still later revision, belong to an extensive series of minute problems respecting the Synoptics which do not affect our main question, and which we are not therefore called on to discuss. We have shown that the main characteristics of our author—his doctrines of the Father, of the Trinity, of the Atonement, of the Church, and of the heavenly world, are woven into the Synoptic narrative in such a way as to give us in the First Gospel a full presentation of Christianity as it was understood by the author or authors of 1 Peter,

and of the great Epistles to the Ephesians and the Hebrews.

It is with less confidence that we add that in the earlier chapters of Acts, especially in the Petrine records, we have a kindred style. There can be no doubt that Luke preserved, while revising, the features of an original account supplied to him. It is supposed that certain elements of his narrative were given him by Philip, but these might refer exclusively to work in the provinces. The speeches delivered in the capital, as preserved to us, show a manner more rhetorical or oratorical than the natural style of Luke, but closely allied to the style we are considering. The discourse on the day of Pentecost shows at least, in its dependence on the Old Testament, the manner of the second group. Still more closely allied in ideas and phrases is the second speech (3^{12-24}). There are the Deutero-Isaian prophecies of the servant, and also the promises to Moses and Abraham; the general argument from prophecy (3^{18}, cf. 1 Pet. 1^{10-12}, etc.), and the conceptions of future seasons of refreshing and times of restoration. This is another expression of the Palingenesia or Regeneration glanced at in Matt. 19^{28}. It is beyond doubt that Luke is here relying on a source, and it is to us extremely probable that that source is intimately related to the author of 1 Thess. 4, 2 Thess. 1. 2, and the final edition of Matthew. The same style is shown in the hymn 4^{24-31}, where we have the manner of quotation, the counsel foreordaining (as in Ephesians and the Book of Wisdom), the holy servant,

the "signs and wonders" (Heb. 2^4, etc.), and the boldness (παῤῥησία) of the preachers. Again, in 10^{34-43} the style of the second group is as manifest in verses 36–38 as that of Luke in the other verses. And there are other instances of words, or references (such as the corner-stone, 4^{11}), or balanced phrases (as in 3^{14} $5^{30.\ 31}$), that point in the same direction, the holy and righteous One, the Prince (ἀρχηνός) of Life, the hanging on a tree (cf. 1 Pet. 2^{24}), the phrase "every soul" (2^{43} 3^{23}), etc.

We note also that the expression "the Lord Jesus" occurs frequently in Acts 1–20. We do not think it is elsewhere in the Lucan writings. It occurs, however, at least nine times in Thessalonians (1 and 2), occasionally in 1 and 2 Corinthians (4 and 3), and once in Philemon, in Ephesians, and in Colossians. There is nothing, of course, impossible in assigning the use in Acts to Luke. But the example in 11^{30}, while the expression is the historian's, shows that this was a special term or designation employed by the preachers who followed Stephen. To this band Silas in all probability belonged. And again, the occurrence in Peter's speech (15^{11}) supports the view that this designation has been preserved by an interpreter of Peter. According to the view of this volume, the author of the second group was a Hellenistic Jew who regarded Peter, not Paul, as the first of the apostles and the chief founder of the Church. Again, in the account of the Council, not only Peter's attitude, with his heart-purification (cf. 1 Pet. 1^{22}), and his figure of the yoke (cf. Matt. 11^{29}), but also James' speech with its references to

the re-building of the Tabernacle and the proselytisation that went on in the provinces, shows that the notes were taken by one in full sympathy with the preaching of the faith to the Gentile world

CHAPTER VIII

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SECOND GROUP OF EPISTLES

IN this chapter we shall attempt to indicate, though only in a summary way, the characteristics of doctrine, ethics, and style which seem to show the homogeneity of the group and the distinctness of the type.

1. First as to more general considerations. They all are messages of Exhortation, the outcome of a new type of ministry which took shape after the facts and doctrines of Christianity were once clearly laid down. They all bear the priestly mark in conceptions of sacrifice and consecration. And they are largely Apocalyptic—the utterances of a "prophet" to whom "the end of all things is at hand." Paul's method remained rabbinical, not priestly but forensic, and he had visions of a continuous (not catastrophic) evolution of history in which an unresting immanent Power worked out the purposes of God.

In this Exhortation group Christianity is an illumination. In respect both of ideas and of life it is a transference from darkness into light. (Eph. 5^{8}, 1 Thess. $5^{5.\,8}$, Rom. 13^{12}, 2 Cor. 6^{14}, Heb. 6^{4} 10^{32}, 1 Pet. 2^{9}, Matt. 5^{14}; cf. as germinal 2 Cor.

$4^{4.6}$.) Closely allied is the conception of Christianity as the Truth. (So in the Pastorals of the same date.) Opposed to it is error, the work of the wiles of Satan, who is the arch-enemy of truth.

In Paul, Faith, the faith of Christ, is the principle of the new life; but here that life is conceived rather as a new moral law of multitudinous precept. The difference is strikingly shown in the Object of faith. Here it is not Christ, or the Son of God, or the Resurrection, but more generally God (as in 1 Pet. 1^{21}, Heb. 6^{1} 11); and throughout Ephesians the term is used, almost objectively, as in the Pastorals. Even 1 Thess. 1^{8} abandons the ground of Paul. And, again, faith is Obedience, or submission to the revealed will of God (2 Thess. 1^{8}, Rom. 15^{8}, Eph. 2^{2}, Heb. 5^{9}, 1 Pet. $1^{2.14.22}$). But Paul refers obedience not to belief but to law and duty and rightful authority; yet Rom. 10^{16} may be reckoned germinal.

2. Coming to Theology we might argue that the Godhead is in Paul conceived as a duality, in our present group as a trinity, and in the Pastorals as a monad. To many Hebrew minds there existed the everlasting unapproachable God, and, beside Him, one who mediated between Him and our world. Thus Paul imagines the one God of whom, and the one Lord through whom, are all things: and this Lord is Christ, the image of God, and agent of creation (1 Cor. 8^{6}, 2 Cor. 4^{4}). The conception is expounded in Heb. $1^{2.3}$, in Colossians and in John. But in John the Being who became incarnate is identified with the Logos, or world-

mind, of Græco-Jewish thought. Of this doctrine there is no trace in Paul, or in the Epistles that bear his name; but there is some indication of it in 1 Pet. $1^{23f.}$, Heb. 4^{12}. And more generally, it may be said that in this group there is much connection, while in Paul there is none, with those Jewish writings (Wisdom, etc.) which carry influences of Greek teaching and speculation. Again, Christ is the maker and inspirer of the O.T. dispensation; the maker of the people (Heb. 3^3, Eph. 1^{11}); the inspirer of Moses and the Prophets (Heb. 11^{26}, 1 Pet. 1^{11}). So in an apocryphal source (Eph. 5^{14}) the Messiah is the source of light. It is possible that the allegorical utterance in 1 Cor. 10^4 is germinal; but even that statement has its parallel in Philo, so that probably we are again outside the Palestinian Judaism. The title πρωτότοκος is used in respect of birth, in its Divine aspect (Heb. 1^6) and its human (Matt. 1^{25}). Paul had used the term of the Resurrection (Rom. 8^{29}). This difference seems to accord with the fact that Paul associated the title "Son of God," with the Resurrection, while in the others it is more easily related to the Virgin Birth, or the Baptismal Voice (Eph. 1^6, Matt. 3^{17}). In all the sinlessness of Jesus is assumed; but in our Exhortation group he is more prominently set forth as the perfect Example (1 Pet. 2^{20-23}, Eph. 4^{13} 5^2, Heb. $2^{10.11}$ 7^{26} 12^2). The Descent into Hades belongs to this group (Eph. 4^9, 1 Pet. 3^{19} 4^6, cf. Matt. 27^{52}). In Acts 2^{31} this doctrine seems referred to Ps. 16. Would Paul, if he had imagined a descent into the under-world, have made illustrative

use of the Burial? The preaching of Christ, subsequent to the earthly life, seems taught in Eph. 2^{17}, 1 Pet. 3^{19}. If these texts refer to preaching after the Resurrection the thought is parallel to the pre-incarnation ministry. The Resurrection is vital to Paul's thought as regards both justification and the power of a new life (Rom. 4^{25} 6^{4}, Phil. 3^{10}). By this Christ becomes the second Adam, the life-giving Spirit. But nowhere in the Exhortation group (not even in Eph. 2^{5}) is moral life traced to the risen Christ. The Resurrection is followed by exaltation to the right hand of God. This statement belongs to the evangelic tradition. It is twice made by Paul, but it assumes theological importance here only (1 Pet. 3^{22}, Eph. 1^{20}, Heb. 1^{3} 8^{1} 10^{22} 12^{2}). *Session* at the right hand is stated here and in Colossians and in the Synoptics, not in Paul or in *Acts*. The exalted Christ is above all celestial hierarchies (Eph. 1^{21}, 1 Pet. 3^{22}, Heb. 1^{6}, Matt. 28^{18}). Perhaps Phil. 2^{9-10} is germinal; but the thought of Paul does not range through the princedoms and dominations of the unseen world. Here, probably, as in Paul and in the Apostles' Creed, Christ is the future Judge of quick and dead (Matt. 25^{31}, 1 Pet. 4^{5}). The language in Matthew shows traces of Platonic or Greek influence. Perhaps beneath the superb rhetoric of this author the conceptions of Christ's redemptive ministry are more economic, less than in Paul due to essential nature.

Regarding the Spirit there is in this group a more habitual tendency towards personalising. Thus Eph. 4^{30} (grieve not), 1 Thess. 5^{19}, Heb. 10^{29},

Rom. 15^{30}, all akin to Isa. 63^{10}; but in Paul the searching and intercession (1 Cor. 2^{10}, Rom. 8^{26}) are, in a different way, equally notable. The Spirit immanent, leading the believer, diffusing Divine qualities in the heart, and producing fruit in the virtues and graces of a new life is a mode of doctrine scarcely found except in Paul. There is indeed the phrase "sanctification of the Spirit" (1 Pet. 1^{2}, 2 Thess. 2^{13}, Rom. 15^{16}); but the phrase denoted not moral progress or renewal but an act of consecration. So in Eph. 1^{13} 4^{30}; and to the same effect, the Spirit seals (after 2 Cor. 1^{22} where Paul assigns the act to God). But in Hebrews Christ is the Sanctifier; and again in 1 Thess. 5^{23} this effect is wrought by the "God of Peace" who in the parallel text (Heb. 13^{21}) perfects. There is therefore nothing stereotyped; and we may regard 1 Cor. 6^{11} as the germinal or suggestive text. Another and primitive idea is that of power (Eph. 3^{17}, Heb. 2^{4}, Rom. $15^{13.\ 19}$). It is not Pauline. And again the gifts (not of vague power, but of skill and goodness), which in Paul are attributed to the Spirit, are in Eph. 4^{7-11}, and apparently in Rom. 12, assigned to Christ. Again, the Spirit is the inspirer of sacred writings or great preachers (Eph. 3^{5} 1^{17}, 1 Pet. 1^{12}, Heb. 3^{7} 9^{8} 10^{15}). Here again Paul disregards popular conceptions, but works out ideas of the Spirit making and moulding thought and feeling and capacity and conduct.

On the titles of God some interesting distinctions may be noted. Paul's usual expression is "God our Father." It is virtually his own, though

imitated in Eph. 1^2 (and in Col. 1^2, Philem. ^{3}). He has also "the God and Father of our Lord" (2 Cor. 1^3, 11^{31}), reproduced in this group in Eph. 1^3, 1 Pet. 1^3, Rom. 15^6. A third designation—"the Father"—he uses, referring to creation at large (1 Cor. 8^6), or the Resurrection (Gal. 1^1, Rom. 6^4, Phil. 2^{11}); and this is frequent in our group, especially in Ephesians, in 1 Peter, and in Matthew (and also in Colossians), though perhaps not quite in Paul's sense. It is to be observed that in Hebrews the conceptions are not of the Father but obversely of Sonship; and that in Matthew the same point of view predominates. There are thus three kinds of Fatherhood: (*a*) towards Christ, found in all except the Pastorals; (*b*) towards Christians, the exclusively Pauline view (until we come to John); and (*c*) towards all men, the view of all except Paul. Paul builds on the Resurrection and on the spirit of adoption; the others on general attributes. Christ is expressly called the Son of God, in Paul, and in this group (Ephesians, Hebrews, Matthew), and in the Timothean Group (1 Thess. 1^{10}, Col. 3^{13}, Mark 1^1), but not in the Pastorals.

It is a bolder thing to predicate of this group a doctrine of the Trinity. We have indicated that here, more than in Paul, Christ is conceived of apart from God, and that the Spirit (often in Paul identified with Christ) seems regarded as a separate personality. Moreover, the three names are often bracketed together as performing respective parts in the economy of redemption. Thus

in 1 Pet. 1^{2} Christians are "elect of God, in sanctification of the Spirit unto . . . sprinkling of the blood of Christ." This method pervades Ephesians. In 1^{3-14} we have the triple hymn "unto the praise of His glory"; in 2^{18} Jew and Gentile have their access through Christ, in one Spirit unto the Father, and in 2^{22} they are in Christ a habitation of God in the Spirit; again, in $3^{16.\ 17}$ they are combined, in 4^{4-6} there are alongside of other triplicities, one Spirit, one Lord, and one God, and in the closing appeal (6^{10-20}) they are again associated. So in Heb. 10^{29-31}, and in 2 Thess. 2^{13} (a variation of 1 Pet. 1^{2}), and in Rom. 15^{30}. Finally, in Matt. 28^{19} the triune name is to be named on all. It is true that the same association may be supposed to be traceable in Paul, in 1 Cor. 12^{4-6}, where gifts, ministrations, and workings are referred to, in 2 Cor. 1^{20-21}, where Christ and the Spirit are named in connection with the varied activity of God, and in 2 Cor. 13^{14}. But in the first two of these there is no evidence of artistic blending or theological purpose; and the effect is discounted by the author's identifications of Christ and the Spirit. In the case of the apostolic benediction we may suppose that the emphasis rests on the graces—grace, love, communion (which last is, in Phil. 2^{1} 3^{10}, referred both to the Spirit and to Christ); or we may believe (as the present writer does) that 2 Cor. 13^{11-14} is not Paul's at all, but is a significant addition and close due to the author of this group. The doctrine of the Trinity, so far as texts are

concerned, rests largely on Matt. 28^{19}, 2 Cor. 13^{14}. Of course, it has rested still more on philosophical conceptions and on a threefold view of the revelation and economy of grace. But if it was first taught by this writer, we may conclude that he reached it by regarding Christ as the Logos or mind of God, and the Spirit as His activity or power.

3. In SOTERIOLOGY we have a vast subject that reveals with fundamental unity distinct diversity of types. Negatively, forensic conceptions cease, and "the law" is no longer the authority or standard. Absent too is the mystic conception of fellowship with Christ, or of federal death and life. The problems of flesh and spirit, of law and grace, of Adam and mankind; the paradoxes, metaphors, allegories, personifications, in their old forms, reappear no more. Positively the new conceptions are most readily found in *Hebrews*, where they are writ large. That Epistle is admitted to diverge pretty largely from *Romans*. In Paul's exposition we read of Propitiation effecting reconciliation and leading to the Justification of the believer, emphasis being laid on the Cross, where Christ bore the legal curse, and on the Resurrection as the confirmation of all. In the other we read of Sacrifice, of a willing and spotless offering, of the remission of sins and the cleansing of the conscience; emphasis being thrown on the Blood, which is the condition of remission and the medium of cleansing. Our contention is that Ephesians and 1 Peter are in essential agreement with Hebrews.

The term "propitiation" does not appear outside Paul (except in John), nor "reconciliation," which Paul teaches four times. Nor do we find the ideas which these terms express. It is true that in Eph. 2^{16} (and Colossians) a derivative of reconcile, *ἀποκαταλλάσσω*, not Paul's *καταλλάσσω*, appears, but not in the same sense. The purpose in Ephesians is to set forth the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile, which is effected on a Divine basis and by Divine means, both finding union through comprehension in one family (cf. the union of husband and wife on a Divine basis, Eph. 5^{25}, 1 Pet. 3^{7}). But this reconciliation to God has its essential meaning in "access in one Spirit unto the Father" (Eph. 2^{18}), an idea frequent in Hebrews. In Eph. 2^{16} we have, indeed, a touch of Paulinism; but the difference is not obliterated. In Ephesians we see Christ removing barriers, bringing Jew and Gentile together unto God. In Paul we see God Himself effecting a world-reconciliation.

This group attributes to Christ's death two results: the remission of sins and free access. The former, *ἄφεσις*, is taught in Eph. 1^{7}, Heb. 9^{22}, 10^{18}, Matt. 26^{28}. In Paul there is no remission, for the guilt is cancelled by atonement. In Mark and Luke-Acts sins are remitted without specific reference to Christ's death. Access is expressed in Eph. 2^{18} 3^{12}, 1 Pet. 3^{18}, Heb. 4^{16} 10^{35}. It takes the place of Paul's liberty (2 Cor. $3^{12.\ 17}$); and perhaps Rom. 5^{2} was germinal.

A frequently recurring difference is that Paul builds on the Cross, this group on the Blood. The

distinction is not absolute. Paul uses "blood" as the symbol of sacrificial death twice in his argument in Romans (3^{25} 5^{9}) and twice in reference to the New Covenant (1 Cor. 10^{16} 11^{27}). The other group mentions the Cross (Eph. 2^{16}, Heb. 12^{2}, cf. 1 Pet. 2^{24}), though not the term "crucify." A common language of Christianity moves through all the types. But Paul conceives God as setting forth Christ, uplifted on the Cross before the eye of the world (Rom. 3^{25}, Gal. 3^{1}); while here Christ comes forward as a voluntary sacrifice (Heb. 10^{10}, Eph. $5^{2.\ 25}$, 1 Pet. 2^{24}). So to Paul the highest life is crucifixion to the world, while to the other it is a cheerful submission to the will of God. To the Blood are attributed redemption; entrance into the Holy Place; consecration by sprinkling; sanctification; purification (or cleansing); remission of sins; cleansing of the conscience (*i.e.* peace with God). All these are in Hebrews; but several are indicated in Eph. 1^{7} 2^{15} $5^{2.\ 25-27}$. Hebrews and 1 Peter may be said to agree in sacrificial conceptions, in the doctrine of free access, and in a moral theory of the Atonement. They agree also in notable phrases, such as the sprinkling of blood, and the double use of *ἀναφέρω* for the offering of sacrifices (1 Pet. 2^{5}, Heb. 7^{27} 13^{15}) and the bearing of sins (1 Pet. 2^{24}, Heb. 9^{28}). On the general points Ephesians agrees; but its author seems to study the avoidance of non-Pauline terminology.

Is it right to say that the group teaches a purely moral theory of the Atonement? This aspect is emphasised in 1 Pet. 1^{19} 2^{24} 3^{18} 4^{1}, and

more strikingly, perhaps, in Heb 9^{14}, Eph. 5^{27}. It is assumed that a new moral life flows naturally from the suffering and sacrifice of Christ. It is as if the author expected from the sacrifice that moral life which Paul expects from fellowship with the Resurrection. But there is a background. There was a purpose in the Sacrifices, now consummated in the offering of the Antitype. "Once at the end of the ages hath He been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself" (Heb. 9^{26}, cf. 9^{28} 10^{18}, etc.). And in the meaning of "sin" we must find the key to the other side of the shield on which is written the theological theory of the Atonement. Paul's ideas of expiation and substitution may not be found here, yet we are taught that by the blood of the spotless Lamb was sealed a new and abiding covenant of peace and life.

One final point of difference. In this group the Death of Christ is a voluntary offering, a self-giving, though to do the will of the Father and though made effective by the Father's raising Him from the dead. Paul and John represent God as the fount of all things, giving His Son to effect redemption and reconciliation. There is of course no contradiction, and Paul himself speaks of Christ's mind as exhibited in self-surrender (Phil. 2^{5-8}, Gal. 2^{20}). But there are, perhaps, behind the two modes of expression two differing philosophies of religion. In Paul the union of Christ with God is more intimate and essential; the doctrine is perhaps higher in regard to both Person and Work.

4. Let us glance at Angelology. Paul's angels

are few and far between. Some rabbinical points are given in 1 Cor. 6^{3} 11^{10}, Gal. 3^{19}. Once he refers to the hierarchies, ἄγγελοι, ἀρχαί, δυνάμεις, but in a peroration where they are grouped, with objects of inanimate nature, amongst the general forces of the universe (Rom. 8^{38}). Finally, in Phil. 2^{10} Christ is exalted so as to receive homage from every being on or above or beneath our world. Paul's language has the vagueness of a man who feels that such beings exist, but that he is not personally related to them. They do not enter into his scheme of thought. But in our group the statements are definite and detailed. In Heb. 1^{4-13} Christ is better than the angels, more honoured and exalted; in 1 Peter he is above "angels, authorities, and powers"; in 1 Cor. 15^{24} above "principalities, authorities, and powers"; in Eph. 3^{31} above "principalities, authorities, powers, and lordships" (Colossians gives "thrones"). Matthew has angels of the Nativity and the Resurrection; Matthew and 1 and 2 Thessalonians have angels of the Parousia. In Matt. 26^{53} and Heb. 12^{22} they are innumerable, and they are ministering spirits. In Matthew also (18^{10}) there are tutelary angels for every child of God. Here, then, we have a distinctive department, due to the connections of the writer with Græco-Jewish literature. And it is noticeable that in addressing Jews (Hebrews, Matthew) his designations are fewest, in addressing Gentiles (as in Ephesians) most numerous.

There is another line of cleavage. In Matt. 25^{41} there are angels of the Devil. In Ephesians the

powers that traverse our atmosphere are of a questionable character. We wrestle with "world-rulers of this darkness" actively engaged in the service of the Prince of the power of the air (Eph. 2^2 6^{12}). But Christ will bring their dominion to an end (1 Cor. 15^{24}. Cf. 2 Thess. 2^{8-10}, 2 Cor. 6^{15}).

The term Devil is not used by Paul. It recurs in Ephesians, Hebrews, 1 Peter, Matthew (and in the Pastorals and Luke-Acts; the Timothean Group follows Paul in the name Satan). The name or epithet *πονηρός* is used of the Devil in Matt. 5^{37}, cf. 6^{13} $13^{19.\ 38}$, and in Eph. 6^{16}, and with an intensive meaning in 1 Thess. 5^{22}, Rom. 12^9, Heb. 3^{12} 10^{22}, and in the other groups. But Paul's one usage, 1 Cor. 5^{13}, is indisputably human. Gal. 1^4 is editorial. Other names are the Tempter (Matthew), Beelzebub (Matthew), Belial (2 Cor. 6^{15}), and the "lawless one" (2 Thess. 2^5). But this group will not give Paul's name, Satan, except that Matthew has it thrice in words of Christ. Corresponding to the differences of name, will be found differences in the spheres of activity. Paul's Prince of evil has his residence in the heart of man.

Equally notable is the Psychology. In 1 Thess. 5^{23}, Heb. 4^{12}, soul and spirit are distinguished, and in the latter minuter subdivisions are indicated. Cf. the parallel analysis of the body in Eph. 4^{16}; and in 4^{23} "the spirit of your mind." Other terms are *ἔννοια*, thought, *διάνοια*, the lower mind, "heart" as a seat of intelligence, and "conscience," which has its chief significance here and

in the Pastorals. The term "soul" is used by Paul in connection with the idea of life; and psychic is contrasted with spiritual. But in Hebrews, 1 Peter, and Matthew higher meanings are frequent, and the soul needs salvation. It is remarkable that the term is avoided in Ephesians, and 1 and 2 Thessalonians. In 1 Pet. 3^{20}, Rom. 13^{1} (and *Acts*) the term is used for person, as in the Septuagint. "Spirit," Paul's word for the higher immortal nature, is in this group used only for the disembodied (Heb. 12^{23}, 1 Pet. 3^{19} 4^{6}). Again, 1 and 2 Thessalonians and Ephesians abstain from handling the word. These silences must be significant of conflict in training or usage or judgment.

5. It is perhaps in the conception of the CHURCH that we find the most distinctive idea of our group, and its most original contribution to Christian thought. In *Paul* the Church is the local Christian community. So, repeatedly, in nearly all his Epistles, and he writes of "the churches" in Galatia or Judæa. The term *ecclesia* must have arisen in Greek-speaking communities; and according to its classical usage would have designated a constituent body or assembly accustomed to meet for common ends. But this local body Paul invests with a high status. The Corinthian Epistles, *e.g.*, are addressed to "the Church of God in Corinth"; and the expression is frequent, being used also of Jerusalem. And so "churches of God" (1 Cor. 11^{16}). This local church is regarded as a unity, an organism, a body. "Ye (Corinthians) are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof"

(1 Cor. 12^{27}). These ideas are idealised, the metaphor is transformed, and the meaning immensely expanded in our present group.

The Church has become the entire Christian community of all lands. Perhaps the first expression thereof is in 1 Pet. $2^{5.9}$. There we have five names for the same thing : race, house, priesthood, nation, people. The Epistle is indeed addressed to Asia Minor ; but it can hardly be doubted that the writer is thinking of the Christian world. And this new organisation he regards as a community that has supplanted the old Israel, and is now the chosen nation and holy people of God. It is James' idea of a rebuilt tabernacle (Acts $15^{14.16}$) or of a new Temple, implying that the old order has yielded place to a new, in which in a broader field of action God will again fulfil Himself.

The term λαός, people, appears in this sense in 1 Pet. $2^{9.10}$, Heb. 4^{9} 11^{25}, Matt. 1^{21} 2^{16}, 2 Cor. 6^{16} ; once also in a quotation from the O.T. in Paul, and once in a "faithful saying" in *Titus*. Similarly the kindred word περιποίησις, peculiar possession, goes through this group. House (or household) is used in 1 Pet. 2^{5} 4^{17}, Heb. 3^{2}, cf. Eph. 2^{19}. This figure combines the ideas of a family (cf. Eph. 3^{15}) which may be scattered, and of a building where the members may meet for common religious life. Idealised, it becomes a "spiritual house" or a Temple wherein God dwells and where He is worshipped (Eph. $2^{21.22}$, 2 Cor. 6^{16}). The figure of a Temple was used by Paul to express the sanctity of individual Christian life, and of the human body in

which the Divine Spirit dwelt (1 Cor. 6^{19}). It is now extended to the community, which in a spiritual sense (cf. 1 Pet. 2^{5}, Eph. 2^{22}) is a habitation of God. But the most fruitful meaning of *οἶκος* is that of a family or commonwealth. On the human side this community is a brotherhood, and consequently *φιλαδελφία* becomes a new duty, distinctive of the group. In Peter we have also "flock," as yet used locally of a pastor's sphere ($5^{2.\,3}$, Acts 20^{28}); but the introduction of Christ as the "chief Pastor and Bishop" (2^{25}) shows how easily the term may be extended, and how appropriately the whole Christian world, with its several folds, may be reckoned one flock (John 10^{16}).

But the conception undergoes a still greater enlargement. The community embraces the redeemed of all ages. This is explicit in Heb. 12^{23}; and it seems implied in the idea of the Body as the fulness of Him who filleth all in all (Eph. 1^{22}). This redeemed humanity is in Revelation styled the Bride, and the Holy City. The name "Church" is so found in Hebrews, Ephesians (and Col. 1^{18}). It is not found in 1 Peter or in the Thessalonian Epistles, where Paul's phrase "churches of God" is repeated with the stronger expression declaring the basis of their corporate life, "church in God." But in Hebrews the application is made to the assembly of the firstborn (from death) who live within the veil. It looks as if the term was first so used tentatively, being coupled with a synonym, *πανήγυρις*, general assembly, which helped to interpret the meaning. Both terms meant a public assembly convened for solemn

purpose; and the association of another which more clearly conveyed a universal significance was sufficient to show that here *ecclesia* bore no limited or local sense. Then in Matt. 16^{18} the conception of an organisation arising and unfolded in earthly history, and embracing the successive generations, is combined with the idea of a Temple or spiritual building. Finally, in Ephesians the doctrine is completed by the conceptions of the Body and the Bride.

This Body is not, as in Paul's figure, a human body whose members may be eyes or ears; and the Temple, with its various wings, is not Paul's temple of the individual whom the Holy Spirit enlightens or sanctifies; and Christ as the Head is not part of the Body but its sovereign Lord, at once the animating Spirit and the directing Master. The Body is a spiritual race and commonwealth of which Christ is the Head, because, as Second Adam, He is the life-giving Spirit. The conception of the Bride or Wife is possibly developed from Paul's metaphor of the marriage of the soul to Christ (Rom. 7^{4}). It represents the "Saviour of the Body" as leaving His Father's home to seek and redeem and possess a people in whom He would realise Himself and complete His nature and will. For the Body is the Pleroma (Eph. 1^{23}), the complement of the King, the visible manifestation of the invisible life. And the Church is created when men, individually filled with His Spirit, are, under His Headship, gathered together into one (Eph. 4^{13} 3^{19} 1^{10}).

6. The region of ESCHATOLOGY is the only one in which the unity or homogeneity of our group is not at once obvious. But the difficulties of the subject are perhaps not insoluble. Before the eye of the Christian loomed a coming Judgment—God's judgment, conducted by Christ. In the language of the Jewish race this event was "the day of God." Paul names it the day of Christ, of the Lord Jesus Christ, or the Lord Jesus. In our second group it becomes "the day of the Lord" (1 Thess. $5^{2.4}$, 2 Thess. 2^{2}), or more briefly "the day" or "that day" (2 Thess. 1^{10}, Heb. 10^{25}, Matt. 7^{22}). And so in Luke and 2 Timothy. A second designation is Apocalypse, or revelation. The substitute is used by Paul in 1 Cor. 1^{7}, Rom. 2^{15} 8^{19}, of three aspects of the supreme events, and in the present group in 1 Pet. $1^{7.13}$ 4^{13}, 2 Thess. 1^{7}. The verb is used in 1 Cor. 3^{13}, Rom. 8^{18}, 1 Pet. 1^{5} 5^{1} (and in Luke 17^{30}). Subsequent terms we must regard as post-Pauline. The term of the Pastorals is Epiphany. But Parousia occurs five times in 1 Thessalonians, three times in 2 Thessalonians, three times in Matt. 24, and in 1 Cor. 15^{23}. We regard these writings as subsequent to 1 Peter (with its Pauline apocalypse), and taking origin from events connected with the Fall of Jerusalem, at which time, perhaps, an immediate Coming was expected. The verb "come" was already in use, as shown in the words of the Institution of the Supper (1 Cor. 11^{26}); but the substitute *Παρουσία*, Presence, has a technical appearance, suggestive that the day is at hand. The term does not occur in 1 Peter or Hebrews or Ephesians. Yet in 1 Peter, besides the "apocalypse,"

we have the sentence, "the end of all things is at hand" (4^{7}). In Hebrews we have the same thought, that the consummation is "now," expressed by the term *συντέλεια*, which occurs also four times in Matthew; we have "a little while" (10^{37}, quoted from Isaiah); and we see "the day approaching" (10^{25}). In Ephesians the doctrine is fainter, though there is the assurance of a "day of redemption" (Eph. 4^{30} 1^{14}). Thus, though there are different modes of expression (the chief three terms being curiously combined in 2 Thess. 2^{8}), in all it is the coming of Christ (1 Pet. 1^{7}, Heb. 10^{37}, etc.); and to some extent the varying Epistles are interlinked, by the double mode of thought in 1 Peter, in Hebrews, and in Matthew. And there are other points of connection in the judgment, the deliverance, the redemption, and the inheritance. When we remember on the one hand the epoch of the Fall of Jerusalem, the martyrdom of apostles, and the convulsions of the empire, and on the other hand the associations of the author with different exponents of the faith, different provinces, and different modes of speech, we may not be surprised at some variation in the statement of the most awful as well as the most sensational of Christian doctrines.

7. Passing from doctrinal considerations, let us glance at the ETHICAL attitude. Paul (we have said) is Pharisaic, his objective is righteousness, his ideal the fulfilment of the Law; but our second author is sacerdotal, his objective holiness, his ideal the perfect will of God. To each belongs a characteristic terminology. But again, to Paul the

new life has its basis in a mystic union or fellowship, so that the spring of conduct is holy love, and the graces of life are the fruit of the union of the soul with its Lord. The other interpretation is summed up in Rom. $12^{1.2}$, where life is represented as an offering, a service, and a sacrifice, with ideas of holiness and good-pleasure, while the aim or standard of conduct is that Divine Will which is perfect and well-pleasing and good. Ideas of holiness and purifying, of living sacrifice and the will of God, may be illustrated from the whole group; and they constitute a body of ethical conception sufficient to impart distinctness. Other terms abundantly used are perfection, renewal, righteousness (ethically), truth (= reality), godly fear, good works, the putting on of Christ or of armour. Again, in Paul faith is the vitalising principle, and here "without holiness no man can see the Lord." Here also (but not in Paul) moral life is (as in the books of Wisdom) often expressed in terms of knowledge. And here (as would be natural in the editor of a Gospel) Christ's personal example, as the Pattern and Perfecter and Leader, is kept in view (Eph. 4^{13} 5^{1}, 1 Pet. 2^{21-23}, Heb. 2^{11-18} 12^{2}, Matt. 11^{29}). Here He is an outward model, while in Paul He is an inward power.

8. Our whole case might be established by a detailed study of religious Terminology. The following may be suggested for investigation: *σωτηρία* (eschatological), *κληρονομία*, *φιλαδελφία*, *φιλοξενία*, *ἀναστροφή* (and verb), *ἀνάπαυσις* (Paul's peace), *ῥῆμα*; God of Peace, foundation of the world,

strangers and sojourners. Some terms occur only in two or three, but suggest connection, as λογικός, 1 Pet. 2^2, Rom. 12^2; παῤῥησιά, Eph. 3^{12}, Heb. four times; ἀκρογωνιαῖος, Ephesians, 1 Peter. Some terms not used by Paul are common to this group and the Pastorals, but belong also to Græco-Jewish literature. Such are ὅσιος, καθαρός, and some of the above. The two groups emphasise Hope much more than even Paul did.

Equally remarkable is it that Paul's special terms and phrases never reappear. His use of "flesh" for human nature, weak, sinful, and opposed to God, is found nowhere else except perhaps in Col. 2^{11-13}; λογίζομαι, which he uses over twenty times, appears in the second group only in the two Epistles that do not bear his name (Heb. 11^{19}, 1 Pet. 5^{12}); so of another favourite term, ἀποδέχομαι, which is found again in Heb. 9^{28}, 1 Pet. 3^{20}; while μὴ γένοιτο appears elsewhere in the N.T. only in a Pauline parable (Luke 20^{9-18}).

9. Under the heading of Method some important distinctions may be grouped. (1) The division of Doctrinal and Practical. In 1 Peter there are three divisions, the general-practical, from 2^{11}, and the more special, from 4^{10}. In Ephesians there is an equal division. In Hebrews the practical begins at 10^{19}, rising to high oratory in 11, and a magnificent climax in 12, and then quietly closing in 13 with precepts and prayer. In 1 and 2 Thessalonians we associate the marked divisions with diversity of authorship. Ethical summaries are given in Rom. 12, 1 Thess. 5,

1 Pet. 5, Heb. 13. Rom. 12–15 were manifestly added to supply this practical part, which to Paul was not separate, but the very essence of the doctrine. (2) All are Epistles of Exhortation; and the practical part begins "I exhort" (1 Pet. 2^{11}, Eph. 4^{1}, 1 Thess. 4^{1}, Rom. 12^{1}), everywhere except in Hebrews, where, however, it is emphatically given at the close (13^{22}), while at the beginning we have the accompaniment "brethren." The term occurs twenty times in Paul; it is found only in 2 Cor. 8, and in connection with an individual. It is an old term of classical Greek which found its way into the Græco-Jewish writings, and thence into all the groups except Paul's, and (losing its sense of "consolation" seen in the translation of the Prophets) became strictly technical. (3) Equally distinctive is the giving of specific instructions to special classes. In 1 Pet. 2^{13}–3^{9} we have duties to the king and government and brotherhood, as well as towards God; with details regarding masters and servants, husbands and wives, and with general exhortations. Duties to the brotherhood are set forth also in Rom. 12, Heb. 13, 1 Thess. 4; to the king or government in Rom. 13; to church ministers or leaders in 1 Pet. 5^{5}, 1 Thessalonians, and Hebrews, who also receive injunctions in turn. In Ephesians the mutual duties of fathers and children, husbands and wives, masters and servants, are lifted from the region of ethics into the higher region of godlike life. This also was, we believe, derived from contact with the Greek system of moral and social

education. In essence the Hebrews were the supreme trainers, though the Greeks might often surpass them in form ; and here we see a Jewish mind learning to express Hebraic thought in the language and manner of the Stoics or of the Græco-Roman world. (4) Connected with the divisions are Doxologies and Prayers ; slightly begun in Paul (Rom. 11^{36}, cf. Gal. 1^{5} = Phil. 4^{20}) ; fully developed in this group, and in 1 Timothy (cf. Rom. 16^{25-27}), and in Jude. See especially 1 Pet. 4^{11} 5^{11}, Eph. 3^{14-19} and $3^{20.\ 21}$, and the close of Hebrews, 1 Thess. 5, 2 Thess. 2. (5) Let us add also the Jewish attachment to sevens and threes. The sevens may be traced in the beatitudes, parables, and denunciations of Matthew, in the unities and armour of Ephesians (4^{4-7} 6^{14-18}), in the glorification of the new dispensation in Heb. 12. The triplicities are everywhere.

10. We may note two elements of distinctive Colouring. The first is dependence on the O.T. In the third and fourth groups (Luke and Timothy?) there is perhaps no original use of that volume. But both Paul and this writer show that they were nourished on the Scriptures. Paul perhaps uses the O.T. history and prophecy mainly for illustration of deep-rooted convictions, and he refers chiefly to historic turning-points—the Fall, Abraham and the Covenant of Promise, Moses and the giving of the Law, David, and the Messianic passages of Deutero-Isaiah. Our present writer often builds on special texts by which his thoughts have been suggested, and he

has much of unconscious reminiscence. He refers oftener than Paul to *Jeremiah*, frequently to *Leviticus* and *Ezekiel*, with which any direct Pauline connection is very doubtful, and (in Matthew, 1 Peter, and 2 Thessalonians) to Daniel. Training or bias is further seen in Paul's allegorical interpretations, and in this writer's acquaintance with the apocryphal books, especially of Wisdom. The other element of colouring is Persecution. In 1 Peter we are in the midst of trials. Hebrews looks back to the "former days," when there was a "great conflict of sufferings" ($10^{32.\ 33}$), and still calls for steadfastness and endurance. Perhaps the eschatological address (Matt. 24) is coloured by similar experience. In the other half of 1 Thessalonians past persecution is recalled. Ephesians advises prudence and circumspection because the days are evil. In Paul's day it is himself that is hunted; but here it is the Christian (1 Pet. 4^{16}). Over all the group is the shadow of suffering; the darkness of clouds which the writer hopes will break with the coming of the Son of man.

11. Our last argument is the literary STYLE. Paul's style is clear, pointed, antithetic; with no vague phrases, or interdependent clauses, or intricate construction; but with logical argument, pithy expression, and occasional ambiguity from his mysticism or the figurative form in which he conceived the facts of redemption and life. The Pastoral Epistles are in a plain literary style with no mystic depths, though with occasional outbursts

of tenderness or beauty. But this writer differs from both. He is imaginative rather than intellectual, emotional rather than argumentative, copious in expression, occasionally impassioned and eloquent. The style is, however, by no means uniform. Besides what may be called normal construction, there are two extremes, the short rapid sentence as in Rom. 12^{6-21}, 1 Pet. 2^{17}, 1 Thess. 5^{15-22}, Heb. $11^{32.\ 37}$, and the long sentence of numerous successive clauses that arise out of another like the successive parts of an obelisk. Such are the paragraph sentences that open 1 Peter, 2 Thessalonians, Hebrews, Ephesians; such, in a less degree, Rom. $15^{15.\ 16.\ 18-21}$, Heb. 6^{17-20} 10^{19-25} 12^{18-24}, and many passages in Ephesians. We know no similar style. It shows an ardent and overflowing mind uttering itself in forms of a second language which it has not fully mastered. I observe that the style of Ephesians is reckoned cumbrous. If so it is the cumbrousness and stiffness of cloth of gold.

Often the phrases are alliterative, as in the opening words of Hebrews, or in such cases as *Πέτρος . . . πέτρᾳ* (Matt. 16^{18}); *πατέρα . . . πᾶσα πατριὰ* (Eph. $3^{14.\ 15}$); *σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος* (5^{23}), *ἄνομος . . . ἀνελεῖ* (2 Thess. 2^{8}), where the thought is as striking as the language.

The coupling of terms nearly synonymous—as wisdom and prudence, night and darkness, shepherd and bishop—abounds in all, and may be illustrated by a hundred examples. It shows a redundant and luxuriant manner where the double expression is loved for the clearness, fulness,

strength, or sonorousness which it seems to impart. Paul, on the contrary, thought in contrasts, and his double expressions appear not in pairs but in antitheses. But a much more remarkable linking of kindred pairs is found in genitival phrases. A simple example is "recompense of reward" (Heb. 2^{2} 10^{35}), in 1 Thessalonians *πάθος ἐπιθυμιας*, and in Eph. 4^{22} *ἐπιθυμιας τῆς ἀπάτης*; in 2 Thess. 2^{13} *πιστει ἀληθειας*, 2^{8} *ἐπιφανεια τῆς παρουσιας*, 1^{11} *εὐδοκιαν ἀγαθωσύνης*. The manner is rare in 1 Peter, though it is indicated in such a phrase as "grace of life"; it is abundant in Ephesians where the writer's style is mature, as in "counsel of His will," "praise of His glory," "good-pleasure of His will," "age of this world." It may be said that the second subst. is adjectival, and that the construction was habitual to the Hebraic mind. Nevertheless, many of the instances are remarkable. Again, the fuller methods of Balance and Parallelism are frequent. Examples are everywhere: 1 Pet. $2^{9.\,10}$ 3^{18}, 1 Thess. 5^{5-10}, Rom. $12^{4.\,5}$, Eph. 2^{12}, $4^{3.\,23}$, Heb. 1^{1} $10^{22.\,39}$ 11^{1}. These various points of style are sometimes combined, as in the words, "effulgence of His glory and the impress of His substance," where, however, the translation obscures the vigour of the original. And in many cases it is seen that the form or mould is insufficient for the overflowing fulness of the writer's mind. Occasionally the language is condensed into the Epigram; "not of works . . . for we are His workmanship" (Eph. $2^{9.\,10}$); or, more strikingly, "as seeing the Invisible" (Heb. 11^{27}); "know the love that passeth knowledge" (Eph. 3^{19};

cf. killed the Prince of life, Acts 3^{14}). But nowhere do we find an antithetic clause or sentence. Style tells its tale as unmistakably as thought.

12. In conclusion, assuming that we have proved the distinctness, homogeneity, and unity of the group, and have shown its manifold characteristics, let us ask whether we can now name the author. Wanted a Jew of priestly birth, of Hellenistic training, of prophetic gifts, a disciple of the apostles, a companion of Timothy, an expounder both of Peter and of Paul—fully comprehending the greatness of the latter, yet assigning the primacy to the former. Two names only of those known to us can suggest themselves, Barnabas and Silas. Barnabas was perhaps too old, not likely to be intimately interested in "our brother Timothy"; apparently not youthful when he joined the apostolic circle; a man of dignified and of benignant character rather than a literary genius who with ardour and brilliancy would enter into the thought of his age. The name of Silas answers every requirement. He was a leading man amongst the Jews of Jerusalem at the date of the Council, and was the chosen representative of the Hellenistic section (Acts 15^{22}). He was a recognised prophet (15^{32}); and in that capacity exhorted and confirmed. He was a co-worker of Paul; and, however much they may have disagreed, is recognised by the apostle (2 Cor. 1^{19}) and by Luke (Acts 16^{25} 17^{4}, where Timothy is not named) as a colleague of equal rank. Such evidence would be speculative were it not that we find in 1 Pet. 5^{12} the name of Silas

inscribed like the name of a painter at the base of his canvas. If he wrote one he wrote all. But again, the Thessalonian Epistles are from Paul, Silas, and Timothy; which, being interpreted, may mean that they are of the school of Paul, written by Silas and Timothy. On the theory of unity of authorship these are proof-texts. And it is easy to see the necessity of this conclusion. Before our group was completed Barnabas was in his grave; as were also all the other first founders of a comprehensive Christianity. And in the second generation the leaders of Christian thought were Gentiles. We need a Jew, and one whose mind was formed in the days of fervour before persecution drove the apostles abroad. The author of the *Hebrews* tells us that he was trained by the apostles or disciples of the Lord at a time when the miracles of healing and the gifts of the Holy Ghost actively confirmed the preaching (Heb. $2^{3.4}$), which means that he was a youth in Jerusalem in the fourth decade (and fifth) of our era. But whence he received, in addition to his apocalyptic fervour, his Latin name, his Hellenistic training, his comprehensiveness of judgment, and his literary accomplishments we must be content not to know. Suffice it to say that in writing to his countrymen he makes himself the spokesman of Peter, his first master, whom he immortalises as the chief of the apostles, the foremost builder of the Church (Matt. 16^{18}); that again, when the apostles are no more, he writes his own ideas in his own name; and that again, when writing to the Gentiles (in 1 and 2

Thessalonians and Ephesians), he makes himself the spokesman of his second master, the unquestioned Apostle of the Gentiles. And perhaps he now realised that the Church of the future was to be mainly Gentile; and that its founder was not Peter, and not the twelve apostles only, but apostles and prophets (Eph. 2^{20}), a right to equal honour having been established by a second order of men of whom Stephen was the first, and of whom Silas himself was not the least.

Silas, besides being a leader of the forward party in the Church of Jerusalem, was a citizen of the empire, possessing that political status which played so important a part in the career of Paul (Acts 15^{22} $16^{37.\ 38}$). It is therefore highly probable that he received a more liberal education than can be claimed for the pupils of Gamaliel. He was a "prophet" and that alone connects him with the apocalyptic literature. The peculiar combination, therefore, in our second group of apocalypse (1. 2 Thessalonians, Matthew), of a tincture of philosophy (Ephesians, Hebrews), and of frequent reference to the books of Wisdom is such as we can justly assign to the distinguished preacher whom we suppose to be the author.

CHAPTER IX

THE THIRD, OR TIMOTHEAN GROUP

THE Epistles which we have assigned to Timothy, and which occupy both in thought and in expression a position midway between the first and second groups, are the following :—

1 Thessalonians 1–3, 2 Thessalonians 3, Colossians, Philemon, Romans 14.

If our suppositions are correct, then Silas and Timothy were comrades who jontly rounded off the Epistle to the Romans, also jointly wrote 1 Thessalonians and thereafter 2 Thessalonians, and finally, no longer in combination but yet possibly in collusion, wrote the twin Epistles, Ephesians and Colossians. Moreover, each enlarged and edited a Synoptic Gospel. Or Timothy may have been a surviving editor and later author.

1. *The Literary Connections*

We shall first look briefly at the parts addressed to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. 1–3, 2 Thess. 3). In these four chapters there is nothing that involves much difficulty. They are the simplest part of the N.T. Neither in thought nor in style is there much

that is distinctive. The writer's mind is full of the idea of Imitation. Paul presents himself as an example (1 Thess. 1^5 2^7, 2 Thess. 3^{7-9}). The people are imitators of us and of the Lord (1 Thess. 1^6), and of the churches in Judæa (2^{14}); and they are admonished to continue in this attitude. But the writer's own style seems constantly, though not completely, imitative.

Thus at the commencement of both we have the designation, "God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ," a combination not found elsewhere, differing from Paul by the great omission of one little word. Again we have three times (1^3 $3^{11.\ 13}$) the designation, "our God and Father," found elsewhere only in two passages (Gal. 1^4, Phil. 4^{20}) which we have assigned to Luke. We suppose that Timothy has transferred it from Philippians. Both Epistles began with thanksgiving for merits which it is pleasant to remember. So also Colossians; and all are perhaps echoes of Phil. 1^{3-5}. The combination, "work of faith and labour of love and patience of hope," reminds us of 1 Cor. 13^{13} in combination with other texts; the construction of *ὑπομονή* with genitive occurs in Rom. 2^7, 1 Cor. 1^6, and belongs to Greek literature. The combination of "faith and love" (3^6) belongs to the Pastorals (2 Tim. 1^{13}), and also the Exhortation Group (cf. also Heb. 7^{13}). The words "weary in well-doing" (2 Thess. 3^{13}) reappear from Gal. 6^9, with the Greek slightly changed. Again, in 2 Thess. 3^{11} reappear the three vices of 1 Thess. 4^{11} in modified and perhaps improved Greek (with

the idea of busy-bodies, as in 1 Tim. 5^{13}). In 1 Thess. 2^{10}, again, the triple "holily and righteously and unblameably" suggest Eph. 4^{24}, Tit. 2^{12}; while the last of the three terms occurs elsewhere only in 5^{23}, but may be derived from the adjective (Phil. 2^{15}). Another triplet, "exhorting and encouraging and testifying" (1 Thess. 2^{11}) contains two characteristic words of the second group and Luke respectively, along with a specially Greek term reappearing in 5^{14} and possibly derived from Phil. 2^{1}. Both of these parallel combinations have taken us back to Philippians, which we found to afford the model of the opening sentences. A very striking sentence is 1^{10}, which is a faint echo of the great sentence (Phil. $3^{20.21}$). It is true that the verb is changed ("wait," instead of "wait for"), and the work of the Deliverer falls far short of the Pauline transfiguration. But the dependence is unquestionable, and on this case alone the whole argument may rest. The verb "wait" is such as either Timothy or Luke would have used; the combination of ὀργή and ἔρχομαι belongs to Eph. 5^{6}, Col. 3^{6}; the doctrine of transformation into Christ's likeness is not fully resumed by any other. We may compare also "as a father with his children" (2^{11}) with the compliment to Timothy himself "as a child serveth a father" (Phil. 2^{22}); and again "readiness to impart our own souls" (2^{8} with Phil. 2^{17}, 2 Cor. 12^{15}). The description of the Thessalonians as "our joy *or* glory *or* crown of rejoicing" is based on Phil. 4^{1} and 2 Cor. 1^{14}. Other reminiscences of 2 Corinthians are in regard to "comfort" ($3^{2.7}$, cf. 2 Cor. 1^{3-6}), and

the assurance that our exhortation is not of error or in guile (2^3, cf. 2 Cor. 1^{12} 2^{17}). Besides the adverb (2^{10}) we have the adjective blameless ἄμεμπτος (3^{13}) following two instances in Phil. 2^{15} 3^6, into which, as we supposed, the term was introduced by Luke. These examples show that 1 Thessalonians derives largely from Philippians and in some degree from 2 Corinthians. And it is surely relevant to observe that both the Epistles proceed from "Paul and Timothy," and were therefore known to Timothy. Of course it might be argued that the non-Pauline terms in these Epistles come really from Timothy; or, contrariwise, that what we now attribute to Timothy is still the style and work of Luke. And undoubtedly the language of these two was akin. But here we seem to have an imitative writer, with little individual power, there an independent thinker qualified to improve the speech of Paul.

The instances we have given are not exhaustive. Thus comparing 1 Thess. 1–3 with Philippians we have μετὰ χαρᾶς 1^6 = Phil. 1^4 2^{29}, τύπος 1^7 = Phil. 3^{17}, ὥστε with inf. 1^7 = Phil. 3^{17}, εἰς τό with inf. $3^{5.\,10}$ = Phil. 1^{23}, ἀγῶν 2^2 = Phil. 1^{30}, παράκλησις 2^3 = Phil. 2^1, προφάσις 2^5 = Phil. 1^{18}, ἐπιθυμία; in a good sense, 2^{17} = Phil. 1^{23}, παρουσία 2^{19} 3^{13} of Christ, cf. Phil. 1^{23} of Paul, labour in vain, 3^5, cf. Phil. 2^{16}; long for (with inf.), 3^6 = Phil. 2^{26}, ὑστερήματα 3^{10} = Phil. 2^{30}, ἅπαξ καὶ δίς 2^{18} = Phil. 4^{16}. Some of these and others belong also to 2 Corinthians; especially ὑστερήμα, 2 Cor. $8^{13.\,14}$ 9^{12} 11^9, to which we may add ἔμπροσθεν (with gen.) 1 Thess. 1^3 2^{19} $3^{9.\,13}$, 2 Cor. 5^{10}.

It is doubtful whether there is dependence on 1 Peter. There also we have τύπος, example 1 Pet. 5^3, cf. 2^{21}. The words "whereunto they are appointed" (1 Pet. 2^8) are very similar to "hereunto we are appointed" (1 Thess. 3^3); but the latter has a different verb in the original, and is more certainly derived from Phil. 1^{17}, "set for," where the Greek is the same. The phrase οἱ πιστεύοντες, which occurs three times (1^7 $2^{10.\ 13}$), appears in 1 Pet. 2^7, but also in Gal. 3^{20}, Rom. 1^{22}, 1 Cor. 1^{21}, and in Acts 2^{44}; and it must have been a commonplace of conversation. While there are therefore similarities there seems no case of dependence, and it is doubtful which is the earlier. Slight connections also exist with Galatians, Romans, and with Ephesians, but not such as to carry any proof of dependence. Nor is there anything to show connection with the Pastorals, τύπος being almost the most notable word in common. The language is undoubtedly akin to that of Luke-Acts; but had Luke been the writer, the connections with the Pastorals, in respect of godliness and moral discipline, would have been frequent.

There are no doctrines to discuss. To God is applied ἀληθινός which is a point of connection with John (Gospel and Epistle), with which Colossians also is intimately connected. Christ is called His Son—a designation which we looked for in vain in the Pastorals, but which is in accordance with Paul and Colossians. The Evil One is called Satan (as in Paul and Mark), and the Tempter (as in Matt. 4).

The phrase "joy of the Holy Ghost" (1^6, cf. 1^5) is akin to Rom. 14^7. The name "Lord" is frequent, and also "Lord Jesus." Faith is represented as "to God-ward" (*πρός τον θεόν*), a preposition nowhere else found, unless it is the correct reading of Philem. 5. The term "faith" also stands repeatedly alone $3^{2.\ 5.\ 6.\ 7.\ 10}$. This view of faith as a general attitude, and as a description of religion rather than of personal relation to Christ, is of course far removed from the Pauline standpoint, and is another mark of close relation to Hebrews. But the Pastoral view of "the faith" as the contents of belief is not found here.

The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians contains a closing chapter in the same style but with little that is new. The influence of Paul is shown in vers. 1 and 4. With the latter cf. Rom. 5^5, Phil. 3^{20}. The statement "all have not the faith" imitates the statement in the second group that some have no knowledge of God. Here also, Paul is held up as an example (ver. 9).

Let us now look at *Colossians*—another Epistle which bears the name of Timothy—not, for the present, to discover its teaching, but to find out, if possible, indications of the style of Timothy. In two general points it resembles 1 Thess. 1–3; it is imitative (assuming for the present that the greater Epistle, Ephesians, is prior), and it stands in precisely the same relation to the O.T., having in its four chapters four allusions of which perhaps not one is an original reference. But as regards detail the

dissimilarity of subject makes further comparison difficult. Colossians is Ephesians without the latter's doctrine of the Church, and with certain additions regarding Gnostic teaching. Only incidentally, therefore, do we find terms that illustrate the writer's natural style. But of these there are several. Thus *ὑστερήμα*, following Phil. 2^{30}, appears in a singular sense in both (Col. 1^{24}, 1 Thess. 3^{10}); and in both contexts we have afflictions and rejoicing. They certainly look like the work of one pen; while the idea in Colossians is surely un-Pauline, as is also the use of "flesh" there, and, in the other passage, of "faith." Another example is *νουθετέω*, admonish, which is used not technically in Acts 20^{31}, 1 Cor. 4^{14}; but becomes technical in the second group, 1 Thess. 5^{12}, Rom. 15^{14}; and so in 2 Thess. 3^{15}, Col. 1^{28} 3^{16}. In Col. 1^{29} we have the two words *ἀγωνιζόμενος* and *ἐνεργουμένην* with the former of which we may compare 1 Thess. 2^{2} (*πολλῷ ἀγῶνι*) and 2^{13} (*ἐνεργεῖται*). The Gospel is emphatically described as preached in every part of the world (1 Thess. 1^{8}, Col. 1^{6})—a pretty clear proof of post-Pauline date. The final salutation, "in my own hand," appears in both (2 Thess. 3^{17}, Col. 4^{18}), following 1 Cor. 16^{21}. The expression, "see one's face," occurs in 1 Thess. 2^{17} 3^{10}, Col. 2^{1}, and along with a reference to hearts, 1 Thess. 2^{17}, Col. 2^{1}; and in the same connection the idea of comforting, 1 Thess. 3^{2}, Col. 2^{2} 4^{8}. The term "tradition" occurs in 2 Thess. 3^{6}, Col. 2^{8} (after 2 Thess. 2^{15}, or 1 Cor. 11^{2}). We have, in Colossians also (cf. 1 Thess. 2^{10}), a group of three

adjectives, "holy and without blemish and unreprovable," where the first two (with the accompanying construction) follow Ephesians; but the last ἀνεγκλήτους is a Lucan term found in 1 Cor. 1^8, and in 1 Timothy and Peter. The phrases seem formed on the model of a similar triplet of adverbs in Theophrastus (purely and holily and righteously).

Again the combination, faith, hope, charity, found together in 1 Thess. 1^3, reappears still more expanded in Col. 1^4. But in neither case is it faith (as in Paul) of the inner spirit, of the soul surrendering itself to its Lord or laying hold of its Saviour. In 1 Thess. 1^{10} it is faith πρὸς τον θεόν, directed towards a God that is living and real; or it is religion, a thing requiring to be made firmer and fuller. So also in Colossians it is a thing to be made steadfast, in which the readers are to be stablished. And it is coupled with love as the other main component of Christian life (Col. 1^4 $2^{5.7}$). Christians are the faithful (or believing) brethren (1^2). This meaning we found already in the Pastorals. Was it now an age that lacked in zeal and was beginning to hesitate under the antagonism and scorn of the world? Does it show that the primitive fervour and sureness of spiritual vision were no longer what they had been? Or is it simply the more natural mode of thought of converts removed from the original centre of the new religion and life? But let us note that in Colossians there is a point of difference from 1 Thessalonians. The faith is now styled "in Christ" or "in Christ Jesus" (1^4 2^5). This seems a

return to Paul, but not entirely. In the one case the construction (ἐν) simply follows Eph. 1^{15}; in the other (εἰς) it is derived from Luke (Acts 20^{21} 24^{24} 26^{18}), or it reflects the speech of its time. One other phrase we here notice. The expression in 1 Thess. 2^{12}, "worthily of God who calleth," appears in Col. 1^{10} as "worthily of the Lord." The first use is in Paul—worthy of the gospel or of the saints (Rom. 16^{2}, Phil. 1^{27})—then in the second group, worthy or worthily of your calling (Eph. 4^{1}, 2 Thess. 1^{11}); but in Hebrews, of glory and blame (3^{3} 10^{29}); and so often in 1 Timothy (Luke); only in Colossians and 1 Thessalonians have we "worthy of" a Divine Person. Paul's metaphor of a "door" appears in Col. 4^{3}, and the idea (though not the word) is found in 1 Thess. 1^{9} 2^{1}, 2 Thess. 3^{1}. Perhaps it may be said that these writings are the closest approximation to Paul in the expression of the missionary spirit.

Verbal connections between Colossians and Rom. 14 are not numerous. They agree in deprecating one's judging another in the matter of food (Col. 2^{16}, Rom. $14^{3.\,12}$); and in the use of the phrase βρώσις καὶ πόσις (2^{16} 14^{17}, cf. Heb. 9^{10}). Both use the Lucan term πληροφορέω fully assured (Col. 4^{12} 2^{2}, Rom. 14^{5}).

Of connection between Rom. 14 and 1 Thess. 1–3, the most notable is the phrase, "joy in the Holy Ghost" (14^{17}), which is similar to, but by no means the same as, "joy of" (1 Thess. 1^{6}).

There is, however, one idea of the first importance in regard to which a connection may

exist between Rom. 14, Colossians, and 1 Thessalonians. In Rom. 14^{17} the "Kingdom of God" is conceived as the moral order on earth. In Paul, and apparently in Luke, the Kingdom is the future world, our heaven (Gal. 5^{21}, cf. Acts 14^{22}, 2 Tim. 4^{1}). But in Col. 1^{13}, the Kingdom (of Christ, as in 2 Timothy), is a sphere or condition in which the believer now is; and 1 Thess. 2^{12} may be considered parallel. Col. 1^{13} has also an affinity with Eph. 5^{5}, where perhaps the Kingdom is future. But in any case the three texts referred to all imply that the Kingdom is already begun.

The Epistle to PHILEMON has points of connection with Colossians both directly in the use of words and indirectly in regard to its dependence on Philippians. From Philippians come the terms at the beginning *συνεργός* and *συνστρατιώτης* (used jointly in 2^{25}), and perhaps also the exordium of thanksgiving. The phrase "the church that is in thy house" is in Col. 4^{15}, but also in Rom. 16^{5} and 1 Cor. 16^{19}; the reference to "my bonds" (ver. 10) is in Col. 4^{18}, but also in Philippians and elsewhere. The strong term "bowels" is in Col. 3^{8}, and Phil. 1^{8}, and also in 2 Cor. The phrase "that which is befitting" (ver. 8) is in Col. 3^{18}, but also in Eph. 5^{4}. Similarly "brother beloved" (ver. 16) is in Col. $4^{7.\,9}$, but also in Eph. 6^{21}. The constr. *πεποιθὼς* with dat. (ver. 21) occurs elsewhere in Phil. 1^{15}, 2 Cor. 10^{7}; the word *ναί* (ver. 20) in Phil. 4^{3} only; the use of *ἅμα* withal in Col. 4^{3} (but also in Acts and 1 Timothy). The term "fellow-prisoner" (ver. 23) is in Col. 4^{10} (and in Rom. 16^{7}). The closing words "with your spirit" are in Galatians,

Philippians, 2 Timothy (Lucan), and may here be repeated from Philippians. The use of "flesh" (ver. 16) corresponds with Col. 1^{24} 3^{22}.

This Epistle is throughout written in language akin to that of Luke. It is therefore possibly a Pauline Epistle (like Philippians) in the words of Luke. But the natural speech of Timothy would probably have been closely allied to Luke's. The Epistle is connected with Philippians either by simultaneity of production (which is not the prevailing view) or by dependence. Its points of contact with Colossians favour the Timothean theory (*i.e.* of common authorship); but no instance is decisive, and the combined effect is simply a probability.

It is, of course, an argument of some importance for the connection of the Epistles that Philemon bears the name of Timothy the brother—the names being combined, not as in Philippians, where we found the penmanship of Luke, but as in Colossians, which exactly follows the form in 2 Corinthians. But the admission of Timothean style does not solve the question whether the Epistle was written by an amanuensis and secretary of Paul or by an independent author.

Many slight points connect Colossians with the Gospel of MARK, where Mark has words not found in the other Synoptics. But it is open to doubt whether these are later additions of a final revision or an earlier form rejected by Matthew and Luke. The most important point is common to Matthew and Mark. In Col. $2^{18\text{-}22}$ reference is made to the controversy regarding food in a manner parallel to the words of Christ in Matt. 15, Mark 7.

Common to the three, there are (as Lightfoot pointed out) three points—the indifference of the things in themselves, the perishableness of meats (as they are used), and the quotation from Isa. 29, regarding commandments and teachings of men. The words of Mark go farther in the introduction of the idea of purifying (7^{19}, cf. Rom. 14^{10}). In the closing verses of Mark we have the phrase, "the whole creation," or every creature, which (without the article) occurs also in Col. $1^{15.\ 23}$. Mark also has "from the beginning of the creation" (10^{6} 13^{19}, cf. Heb. 9^{11}). In the same closing verses ($16^{12.\ 14}$), we have the application of *φανερόω* (pass. manifested) to the risen Christ, a usage to which perhaps the nearest approach is Col. $3^{3.\ 4}$ (and 1 Pet. 5^{4}); but it occurs also in the postscript of John (21^{14}). There are approximations to the style of Luke, *ἀπιστής*, as vers. 11. 16 (so Luke $24^{11.\ 41}$, 2 Tim. 2^{13}, Rom. 3^{3}), *ἐπακολουθέω* (1 Tim. $5^{10.\ 24}$, 1 Pet. 2^{21}), *βεβαιόω*, a classical term, *ἐφάνη* (so Luke 9^{8}); others remind us of Paul, as *κατακρίνω*, *συνεργέω*, and others perhaps of the second group, as *σκληροκαρδία*, while there are also points of contact with John.

Again, we may note as comparatively prominent in Mark and Colossians the ideas of growing, increasing, and fruit-bearing. Thus *καρποφορέω* is used, without parallels, in Col. $1^{6.\ 10}$, Mark 4^{28}; *αὐξάνω* thrice in Colossians (twice in Ephesians); *ἀναβαίνω*, Mark 4^{32}, in the Parable of the Mustard Seed. The thought is Pauline.

We have already observed that in the rendering

of Mark 4^{22} = Matt. 10^{26}, where the latter has "revealed," and "known," the former has "manifested" and "brought into light," a difference corresponding to characteristics of Ephesians and Colossians.

The metaphoric reference to salt (Col. 4^{6}, Mark 9^{50}) is certainly more than an accidental coincidence. In both cases we have the unusual word ἀρτύω (also in Luke), and the interpretation (not in Luke) as indicating right conduct towards others. In the opening verses are two great expressions that correspond to Colossians, the description "Son of God," not given as a Messianic title, but as a theological conception (cf. 1 Thess. 1^{10}, Col. 1^{13}); and the phrase ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν (1^{4}, cf. $3^{28.29}$), found also in the second group, Matt. 26^{28}, and frequent in Luke-Acts, so Col. 1^{14}. The Pauline use of faith with the gen. occurs in Mark 11^{22}, Col. 2^{12} (and Acts 3^{16}). Individual words occur, as ἀχειροποίητος, Mark 14^{58}, Col. 2^{11} (and 2 Cor. 5^{1}). The combination, "praying and asking," is found in Mark 11^{24}, Col. 1^{9}.

It is now said that the most Pauline of all the Gospels is Mark's. The fact would require no other explanation if it could be shown that the final editor was Timothy.

This argument regarding *Mark* is, of course, slight and inconclusive. It would be weaker if the words υἱοῦ Θεοῦ in 1^{1} were entirely rejected. But the fact that these do occur in two of the best MSS. is some evidence for the theory of an edition subsequent to the original publication. This Gospel is closed with a late paragraph based on the

other two Synoptics and on Acts. Our suggestion is that this addition was made by Timothy, who at the same time added other touches for purposes of elucidation. The language of this closing paragraph is allied to Luke's; and the term μορφῇ (ver. 12) is doubtless transferred from Philippians. Points of diction as well as of doctrine accord with the view that the editor was the author of *Colossians*.

2. *The Doctrine of Colossians*

The Epistle to the Colossians differs considerably from every other of the N.T. In feeling and fundamental thought it is closely allied to Paul. But in its distinctive thought, and often in expression, it is allied to or dependent on Hebrews. Its relations, however, are most intimate with Ephesians; though it refuses to handle (except in relation to the Head) that Epistle's chief doctrine, the Church, and, instead, presents a chief subject of its own in the refutation of a Gnostic heresy that limited the power of Christ and urged a wrong asceticism. But the Epistles have much in common that makes dependence indisputable. The question of precedence can hardly be said to be settled. But, notwithstanding the arguments of Pfleiderer and others, to us it seems hardly possible that the much more powerful author of Ephesians could have slavishly borrowed from any one. A theory of simultaneity of production is not impossible; especially if the authors were personal friends, and, in using common language addressed to different

readers, were unconscious that they were writing for the ages.

In Christology the position is the same as in Hebrews and John. The language is partly Pauline; in the description of Christ as the image of the invisible God (1^{15}, cf. 2 Cor. 4^{4}) and the agent in creation (1^{16}, 1 Cor. 8^{6}). But the words of Colossians go farther in the statement that *in* Him (as a cosmological basis) all things consist. The personal description is also enlarged by the application of πρωτότοκος, not merely, as in Paul, to the risen Christ who is head of a new spiritual creation, but to the pre-mundane and pre-existent Son of God, the First of all spiritual powers. Here, then, we have Paulinism faithful to the original, yet reconceived in contact with the philosophies which in the last quarter of the century the preachers encountered in the centres of Greek culture. The language doubtless owes its emphasis to speculations that minimised the personal greatness and the perfect work of Christ; and so with reference to redemption the writer proceeds to unfold the same supremacy. Christ is Head of the Church, the complete Reconciler, who in His incarnate life possessed the fulness of Godhead, and in all stages occupies the first place, the pre-eminence (1^{18-20}). And here we note that while in Paul the redemptive work of Christ is related to man, and, in the second group, to man and the underworld (earth and Hades), in Colossians it is to man and an upper world (whether they be "things upon the earth or things in the heavens"). This is the same importance as

is attached in Ephesians or 1 Peter to the exaltation of Christ. He fills all and rules all. His authority is in every sphere; but the reconciliation to God of heavenly beings seems a new note, different from Eph. 3^{10}, and (as we suppose) later in expression. But along with developments there seems a closer adherence than in Ephesians to the mode of thought of Paul. Thus the Reconciliation (1^{19-22}), while described as in Ephesians, is attributed to the "good pleasure of God," while in the second group the reference to God is absent. (For the term εὐδοκέω, cf. 1 Cor. 1^{21}, and also 1 Thess. 2^{8} 3^{1}.) And a harmony of Paul and the second group is attempted in the phrase, "through the blood of His Cross" (1^{20}). Another equally unexpected combination is the phrase, "the body of His flesh," in which, again, two lines of thought are brought together (1^{22}, cf. Eph. $2^{15.\ 16}$, where again Ephesians must be prior). Also, the inworking in power, which in Eph. 3^{16} and 1^{19} is attributed to the Spirit or to God, is here (1^{29}) assigned to Christ. And the mystery of Christ which has to be set forth is not, as in Ephesians, the bringing together of all races, but in more Pauline conception, "Christ in you the hope of glory" (cf. Gal. 4^{19}, 1 Tim. 1^{1}).

Another Pauline echo is the writer's joy in their "faith in Christ Jesus," where, if the phrase is different from the apostle's, we find the same object of faith (1^{4} 2^{5}). And the Pauline imagery of "buried in baptism," "raised in Christ" (2^{12} 3^{1}), returns to us, but tinged in both cases with the language of Ephesians. Again, we have side by side the for-

giveness of sin and the "blotting out of the bond" ($2^{13.\ 14}$), as if to assure us of the harmony of ethical and forensic conceptions; and thereafter more of Paul in the description (taken from Heb. 10^{1}) of the ceremonial law as a shadow (2^{16}), and in scorn of the beggarly "elements" or rudiments (2^{20-23}, cf. Gal. $4^{3.\ 9}$). The description of Christ as the Head from whom all the body takes its increase is a modification of Eph. $4^{15.\ 16}$, strengthening it by the phrase, "increase of God," which recalls 1 Cor. $3^{6.\ 7}$. Again, $3^{1.\ 2}$ has the Pauline spirit as shown in Philippians in the desire for fellowship with Christ and in the heavenly ideal (Phil. 3^{10} 4^{8}). The expression, "ye died" (3^{3}), is peculiarly Pauline; but the accompanying words point rather to a Johannine mysticism. The phrase, in Christ are "all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden," is in substance thoroughly Pauline (1 Cor. 1^{30} 3^{22}), but partakes of the form of expression due to contact with occult theosophisings. Chaps. 3 and 4^{1-6} are ethical, parallel to, if not based on, Ephesians; with the deeper or more transcendental thoughts omitted, or expressed in simpler and more practical speech. Personal references of great value close the Epistle.

Colossians differs from the first and second groups by the paucity of its references to the O.T. Of the four passages so noted it may be doubted if in any the reference is original. One (2^{22}) comes through the Gospels (Mark, Matthew), and shows that the writer was familiar with that saying of Christ. Another (3^{1}, "seated on the right hand of God"), also found in the sayings of Christ, belongs to

Ps. 110 and Daniel, but is not exactly quoted from either. It is part of the evangelic tradition. A third (3^{10}) has reference to the creation of man (cf. Eph. 2^{10} 4^{24}), and recalls the Divine "image." But whether Ephesians or Colossians is prior is by no means clear. Nor is it clear whether Colossians means pointedly to assert that Christ was the creator of Adam. The remaining passage (2^{3}) contains the "treasures of wisdom," as in Prov. 2^{3}, and the word "hidden," which occurs in the same connection in Isa. 45^{3}, but which must have been well known descriptive of both as a literature of the preceding two centuries and of a method or cult still prevailing. There is certainly a connection between this text, with its "treasures," "hidden," invisible, and the "opening" thereof (cf. Col. 1^{15} 4^{3} as well as 2^{3}); but it is probably indirect, through the intermediate influence of the apocryphal literature. In any case, we may affirm that this writer does not, like Paul or the author of Ephesians, draw from the O.T. His allusions were already familiar allusions; but they may be held to indicate some knowledge of the Septuagint, such as, we know, Timothy possessed (2Tim. 3^{15}).

Everything seems to correspond with the possibility of Timothean authorship; the fundamental resemblance to Paul, the co-operation with the author of Ephesians, Lucan vocabulary, Johannine elements (the Gospel of John is supposed to have issued from Ephesus, where Timothy was for a time settled). And to these may be added a love of philosophising, against which the author of

1 Timothy (6^{20}) thought it necessary to warn this imaginative youth, and a missionary spirit, shown in a desire for the propagation of the gospel in all lands such as accords with the sketch in Phil. 2^{20}—a characteristic which we do not find in the writings of any other, except, of course, in Paul, where it is a burning and a shining desire. We found that 1 Thess. 1–3 was largely dependent on Philippians, and the same dependence belongs to this Epistle. In the midst of the parallelism with Ephesians we find the striving for perfection, attained through fellowship (as in Phil. 3^{10-15}), the renewal unto knowledge (3^{10}), which may be compared with the same passage, the conception of *ἀγάπη* as inclusive of all the virtues (3^{14}, Phil. 1^{9}, 1 Cor. 13), the seeking of things "above" (3^{1}, cf. Phil. 3^{14} 4^{8}), and so definite an imitation as "let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts" (3^{15}, = Phil. 4^{7}), where, as in 2 Thess. 3^{16}, Christ (not God) is the Lord and Giver of Peace. There is also in the commencement the same note of thanksgiving and supplication, the same desire for the progress of the gospel, the same eagerness to promote the universalism of Christianity and the universality of its blessings ($1^{6.\ 28}$).

It does not appear to us that this Epistle sets forth any new view of Christian truth. It presents the faith once delivered, reasserted in the face of the questionings of Asian theosophists. The form of statement depends on the speculations that are combated, and this semi-controversial character has led to omissions on the one hand,

to exceptional emphasis on the other. More than any other it is written with the one object of upholding the supremacy of Christ. Of that supremacy the author's conception transcends every limit. Men talk with persuasiveness of speech regarding occult philosophy and the mysteries known to the initiated; but Christ is the "mystery of God," and in Him are not particular doctrines and powers, but all the treasures whether of science or of philosophy. This universality of the sphere of Christ embraces all thought, all being, all conduct. Therefore the believers are exhorted to be immovably rooted and firmly built up in Christ, so that in Him will be found the sphere of their life and walk.

Christ is the foundation; He is also the Head. They that simply accept Him as a prophet or religious teacher, possessed like other prophets of limited knowledge and authority, imperil all things. Equally erroneous would it be to regard Him in His pre-existent character as one of a succession (though the highest) of preternatural beings that have emanated from the Godhead. Therefore the Headship must be set forth in its cosmic and eternal significance. It is here that Colossians goes farther than Paul or the author of Ephesians. In the latter a sort of inferiority of Christ to God seems implied (Eph. 1^{17}, 1 Cor. 15^{24}). But here (Col. $1^{16.\ 17}$) all things of our universe exist through Him and unto Him and in Him. He is the Alpha and the Omega and the continuous upholder of all creation. Such a statement

is allied to and virtually identical with the Johannine doctrine of the Logos. Christ is the equal of the invisible God, and His Representative acting in the sphere of things visible; the Divine objectified, manifested in creation, and embodied in flesh. Such a conception belongs to philosophy, but the author is writing to men who claim to be philosophers. Only in this form can the truth and authority of Christianity be conserved. The words embody the religious view of the universe as created and upheld by God, and as directed to some high goal; and they conceive Christ as the manifestation in human form of that Divine Power, which is identical in essence with the hidden invisible God, and which has been manifesting itself in time in all the forces and laws and works of nature. And this supremacy over nature includes supremacy over all created being; therefore over the angelic or spiritual hosts, whether they be thrones or principalities, and with whatever attributes they are invested. Christ as the firstborn of all creation is the Head and Lord of all such. Even in His incarnate life, the fulness of the Godhead, the Divine glory and perfections, dwelt in Him. As risen from the dead He is again the firstborn of the new spiritual creation. And in this capacity He is the Head of the Church, the life-giving Lord from whom all the body that is united with Him derives nourishment and increase. Everywhere, therefore, He is first; in His pre-existence, above archangels or demigods; in His humanity, above

all men ; in His permanent lordship over His people, above all other masters or mediators or leaders of men.

The importance of all this for the Colossians is in the assurance it conveys of the completeness of the Christian redemption. The Head imparts to the Body His own Divine life, "the increase of God"; and the faithful who enter into fellowship with their Lord are complete in Him ($2^{10.\ 19}$).

This position is variously described. The change of state is implied in the words "delivered out of the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of the Son of His love" (1^{13}). The essential point in the redemption is the "remission of sins." This is obtained by a reconciliation or peace-making effected by God through the blood of His cross, and again "in the body of His flesh through death" ($1^{20.\ 22}$). The term "reconciled," ἀποκαταλλάσσω, is the same as in Ephesians, and the ἀπο must convey some modifying shade of meaning. But the idea is essentially the same as in 2 Cor. 5^{19}, "God was in Christ reconciling the world." There may here be more immediate reference to alienations and divisions in the world at large ; there is one explicit extension in the reconciliation of beings "in the heavens"; there is the same conception as in Ephesians, though less emphatically expressed, of the unity of all things and of Christ as the unifier. Nevertheless the main idea is, as in Paul, the salvation of the individual, and the presenting of Him holy and spotless and unreproved (1^{22}). In

Ephesians the writer is full of the conception of the Church and the privileges of access; but in Colossians the emphasis is thrown on the new lives of individual men and the effort by admonition and discipline to present every man perfect in Christ (1^{28}). Again, the redemption is described more particularly as the forgiving (χαρίζομαι) of trespasses and the blotting out of the bond (the legal condemnation). By a bold figure, this legal warrant or authority is regarded as nailed to the Cross (2^{14}) and thereby publicly annihilated. Similarly, the putting off of the body of the flesh was a spiritual circumcision which is the true circumcision of the Christian who enters into fellowship with Christ (2^{11}). And thus in the Cross the power of the evil agencies was broken; their claims on guilty men were cancelled; and over them Christ publicly triumphed (2^{15}).

Again, in true Pauline fashion the Christian is supposed to enter into fellowship with Christ both in His death and in His resurrection. "Ye died, . . . buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him through faith in the working of God; . . . raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above" (2^{11} $3^{1.\ 3}$). These may not be the identical thoughts of the Master; but they are an endeavour to reproduce them, and to hold up the same idea of mystic fellowship, and to make the believer know that he has in Christ the power of a new life.

In all these passages our Epistle goes back to Paul, and also blends therewith the doctrines

(including the ascension and session, the mastery of principalities, the reconciliation and union of all worlds, and the headship of the body) that belong to Ephesians. And the same is true of the more strictly ethical teaching. If moral life is human it is also Divine. It is God who has made us fit to be partakers of the inheritance (1^{12}); it is in Christ that we are complete (2^{10}); Christ worketh within in power (1^{29}); from the Head all the body is supplied (2^{19}); Christ is our life (3^{4}); He is in you the hope of glory (1^{27}). Nevertheless, people and preachers must strive, using every means of instruction and co-operation, resolutely mortifying what is sinful, and putting on new graces of goodness rich in all the elements of that love which is the bond of perfectness (3^{14}). The aim is perfection or complete fulness (1^{28} 3^{14} 2^{10}), and this includes being made "holy and without blemish and unreproveable." For the objective is a world of saints in a region of light and glory (1^{12} 2^{27} 3^{4}).

These passages show that this writer possessed the mind of Paul. So fully is this the case that critics are going back to the Pauline authorship, though no church existed in Colossæ in the life-time of Paul; and others frame composite theories finding in the Epistle original nuclei or fragments of a primary letter. But Timothy was a pupil of Paul in boyhood, and for ten years a companion. He was the apostle's dearest son, in comparison with whom in Christian zeal he knew "no one like-minded." Paul had associated Timothy's name with his own in 2 Corinthians and in Philippians.

Timothy might therefore well claim to be the apostle's interpreter; and in him we might expect to find that the apostle, though dead, still lived.

So far we have paid little attention to two points that are of some importance in the interpretation of the Epistle—the nature of the so-called Colossian heresy, and any divergence in the Epistle from ordinary Christian conceptions. The heresy has been investigated with great learning, and the general conclusion is accepted that it combined a questionable *gnosis* with an unwarranted asceticism. But there is nothing in these words that does not apply to half the theosophisings of the world. This gnosis concerned itself with speculations regarding supernatural beings—angels or demons, principalities, æons, or mahatmas, or whatever they may be called. These Gnostics were semi-Christians, or exploiters of Christianity, or controversial opponents. There would be some on both sides. But the inference to be drawn from this Epistle—where they are attacked not directly (as Paul would have attacked) but indirectly, and by frequent reference to derogating theories—is that they refused to acknowledge fully either the uniqueness of Christ's personality, or the completeness of His work, or the finality and perfection of the Christian revelation. On the contrary, they worshipped angels, and prided themselves in occult discoveries, and lightly regarded the true Head ($2^{18.\ 19}$). The same general tendency is referred to as is indicated in the "myths and genealogies" of the Pastoral Epistles, and in the more fully

developed doctrines of æons that flourished in the next century. Whether the teachers were Jews or Greeks, Essenes or Pythagoreans, and whether they had imbibed elements of Buddhism or Zoroastrianism cannot be conclusively determined, though it is certain that both Jewish and Greek elements were involved. But again, the emphasis on circumcision, and the bold conception thereanent, together with the epithet Jewish in the Pastorals (Tit. 1^{14}), is a conclusive proof that as yet those with whom Christian teachers had to do were mainly of Semitic race. Yet this is no proof that the real centre of the system was Jewish. Large communities might still have been outside the ken of the Christian teachers. The conceptions of the pleroma and of the demonic hosts can hardly have originated in Palestine, though amongst the Hellenising Jews of the Dispersion they seem to have found some fields of fruitful soil. But the effect in the province of Asia has been to accentuate the greatness of Christ. And accordingly Christ is here presented as one in whom the pleroma is concentrated, a pleroma not of powers of the air, but of the Godhead, a pleroma which makes Christ the centre and the lord of all things—of the past and of the future, of the heavens and of the earth, of the universe at large and of the saints of God.

The complement to these theosophisings or genealogic speculations is the unnatural asceticism so severely condemned in 1 Tim. 4^{1-3}. These must have gone much farther than the usual vegetarianism or celibacy. They were mixed with

theories of the clean and unclean; but they had also the notion that all matter is corrupt. The writer remembers Paul's scorn of the childish rudiments, the beggarly elements which should have been left far behind (Gal. 4^9); and in the same category he places the ordinances, the authoritative prohibitions (handle not, etc., 2^{21}), which were now being thrust in the face of the infant Church in Asia Minor. Whatever might be the full philosophy of these matters, the writer had learned from Paul that they contravened the liberty of the gospel. And Paul's Master had with equal emphasis set aside these commandments of men, and had "purified all meats" (Mark 7^{19}).

But along with the morally indifferent questions of food and contact were the vital questions of moral conduct. Asceticism is by no means purity, and its goal is too often moral indifference. This author exhibits the true life hidden in its source, raised by a Divine power to a higher level of existence, and conversant with things above. And he demands of the followers of Christ the true asceticism, the mortification of all evil desire.

A question, not entirely idle, is whether the writer himself in any measure shared these theosophising and ascetic tendencies. It is evident that the author of the Pastorals felt not quite sure of Timothy (1 Tim. 6^{20}). But if he is the writer and was enamoured of these speculations, it is certain that he made a good use of them. In one or two points this Epistle stands apart. One is

the reconciliation of the supernatural entities (1^{20}). Certainly in no form could the lordship of Christ over these be more emphatically asserted. Christ is even their Creator and Redeemer: and to Christ they will owe their place in the everlasting Kingdom. This may, indeed, be implied in the second group, where all "authority in heaven and earth" (Matt. 28^{18}) is given unto Him, and where by His exaltation He is placed above the authorities and powers (Ephesians, 1 Peter). And again, in Eph. 6^{12} these are the supreme enemies with whom the moral struggle is maintained; they are (as apparently in Col. 2^{15}) the hosts that wage the active warfare of the Evil One, and would thwart the salvation of men. But here Christ conquers them, and wins them to His side, and makes them subserve the Kingdom of God.

Again we have the notable phrase, "the power (or dominion, or principality) of darkness" (1^{13}). The contrast of darkness and light is frequent enough in the second group, but in a subjective ethical sense and in the style of moral exhortation. But here the usage seems not subjective but objective; and the phrase denotes a fallen world subjected to sin and ignorance, "lying in the Evil One" (1 John 5^{19}). It makes the matter not less difficult that the words are assigned to Christ Himself (Luke 22^{53}); and also that this passage and the notable sentence (Acts 26^{18}), are interdependent. The probability seems to be that Colossians (1^{12-14}) was written with Acts 26^{18}, as well as Eph. 1^{7}, before the writer's eyes; and that not

only are the words slightly changed, but their meaning is also modified. The writer sees two great kingdoms or spheres of existence—darkness and light, evil and good, Satan and Christ. It is true also that in Eph. 2^2 (or 2 Thess. 2^9) the Prince of the power of the air worketh in the sons of disobedience. But probably in Colossians the empire of darkness is something more decisive and universal than is suggested in the other Epistles. It is a conception of the whole world as corrupt (1 John 5^{19}, 2 Pet. 1^4). Such statements are on the outer verge of Christianity.

Once more, on the question of meats there is a difference between Colossians and 1 Timothy. Was Timothy an ascetic in his old days, and was it in consequence thereof that with gentle censure he was advised for the benefit of health to take a little wine (1 Tim. 5^{23})? In any case, while the author of the Pastorals regards all food as "sanctified by the word of God and prayer," the more subtle theologian finds here also purification in the Cross. Christ the Reconciler is Lord of all things; and they that have experienced the spiritual circumcision are not to be judged in meats or drinks or feasts or holidays—which are a shadow of the things to come—but the body is Christ's. Of these, as of the Sabbath (Mark 2^{28}), the Son of man is Lord.

In any case, as there is a true and a false philosophy, so there is a true and a false asceticism. These enactments of ordinances are valueless for the moral life of man. The writer tacitly appeals

to experience in the assertion that they are inefficacious against the indulgence of the flesh (3^{23}). And on the other hand he shows that he has entered fully into the Christian theology and ethics. He can distinguish the essential and the non-essential. Like Paul he finds the source of power in mystic inward communion, and he strengthens himself by a faith that hopefully looks forward to coming blessedness (1^{5} $3^{3.4}$). He is an ascetic in regard to things sinful, a mystic in regard to things spiritual, a theologian in the knowledge of the love of God and the fulness of the redemptive work of Christ. He is conscious of having entered into the Kingdom of Christ (1^{13}), a region wherein the graces of character may grow into the fulness of flower and fruit.

It is impossible not to notice the resemblances betwen Colossians and John. The name Son; the identification of the Divine with light, and of evil with darkness; the subjection of the world to evil, Christ or the Logos as the Creative Divinity, by whom and for whom are all things, and without whom is nothing; Christ as life and the life of men; the historic Jesus as One in whom the Logos tabernacled, the fulness of Godhead dwelt,—possessed of the pleroma, or full of grace and truth, from whose fulness His people receive; glory as another name of heavenly blessedness, and the communication thereof to Christ's people when their Lord will be manifested; the perfection of Christ's work (*τελείωσας*, *τετέλεσται*; *πεπληρωμένοι*); the desired unity (John 17, Col. 2^{2});

knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις, Col. 2^2 3^{10}, cf. John 17^3); love.

In all this there is no direct dependence, unless it be in the parenthetic sentence 3^4 (= 1 John 3^1). But this fact makes it the more probable that in his later years Timothy was associated with the author of the Johannine writings. In 1 Thessalonians we found nothing of this kind, except the name "Son," and the epithet of God ἀληθινός. It is true that some of the points in common belong also to Paul; but there remains a group of resemblances such as will be found nowhere else. We are therefore compelled to think of the ancient tradition which located both John and Timothy in Ephesus, making them successive leaders of the Church there. It is, of course, the fashion to deny that John was the author of the Gospel and Epistle that have been ever associated with his name. But if on the one hand it is difficult to suppose that an aged Galilæan apostle could have put into artistic shape writings in which all the essential aspects of the various types of Christianity are subtly and harmoniously blended, it is on the other hand equally difficult to suppose that undisputed traditions regarding the longest lived of the disciples of Jesus should be altogether wrong. It is possible that the Fourth Gospel is John's in the sense in which Colossians is Paul's. And if in its literary completeness it was the work of an unnamed disciple in Ephesus, that disciple would naturally have been a colleague or friend of

Timothy. Personal acquaintance is sufficient to explain the points of community. In both cases the form is affected by the schools of thought and the modes of controversy that prevailed in Ephesus. By these and by contact with the last and not the least revered of the apostles, Timothy's ideas would have been still enlarged. And therefore, though his purpose in Colossians was to set forth the doctrines of his original master, it was inevitable that some Johannine element should glide into the text. And thus it is that letters, like photographs, may convey to distant discerning ages the face and features of the situations out of which they rise.

This letter is addressed to the Colossians, but it was also to be read in Laodicea; and if it was not already read in Ephesus and Hierapolis we may be sure that the substance of it was often spoken. It is addressed in reality to the rising Christian Church in a noted region of Asia Minor. That district had been the home of theosophisings and strange cults for centuries before the coming of Christ, and the same occult and ascetic tendencies continued for centuries after. But in ordinary circumstances these antique systems would have made no impression on a Christian church. The advent of Christianity was itself an awakening. These progressive movements rouse forces of antagonism, and call into activity semi-dormant dispositions. This Epistle, we may well believe, was written with definite adversaries in view, to

defeat those who "withstand the truth, men corrupted in mind, reprobate concerning the faith" (2 Tim. 3^8). And if we once admit that it belongs to the closing stage of the N.T. canon, there seems no rashness in directly connecting it with the arch-heresy which arose in the last twenty years of the first century and filled this region with its noise. Cerinthus was remembered in the second century as the opponent of John. Their personal encounters took place in Ephesus; and it was said that the Gospel of John was written for his refutation. Cerinthus was educated in Alexandria and must have had a Logos doctrine of his own. The records of his teaching that survive correspond exactly with what in this Epistle is denounced. His theories were primarily Judaistic. But he added a Gnostic system of æons, according to which the world was created by inferior beings and did not share the perfections of God. His theories of cosmogony and angelology may well have been what is here repudiated. And with regard to Christ he regarded Him as in the first instance simply man, made Messiah at the baptism, but not thereby endowed with an indwelling pleroma. There is nothing improbable in the opinion that this Epistle was a direct answer to Cerinthus. That answer is given in the name of the Apostle of the Gentiles; it is so written as to convey the mind and authority of Paul. Let us not withhold the meed of admiration from the brilliant youth who had been solemnly charged to guard the sacred deposit against the inroads of the

profane babblings and the knowledge falsely so called, and who was able to use his own speculative and assimilative talents not only for the exposure of erroneous and fruitless tenets, but also so as to make the most daring philosophy of his day a means of setting forth, in the fulness of manifold excellence, the supremacy and glory of His Lord.

CHAPTER X

THE FOURTH, OR PASTORAL, GROUP

IN the Pastoral Epistles we are in a new atmosphere. Both thought and expression are different. The language is comparatively secular, not less devout but less Scriptural, as if the author had been reared not on the O.T. but on the ethical teachers of the Empire or of Greece. He is no theologian interested in subtle disputation or transcendent speculation, but a pious and practical preacher, concerned with the management of the congregation and the maintenance of moral life. We have here almost nothing of the Pauline soteriology, of propitiation and reconciliation, justification and the righteousness of God; nothing of the immanence of the Holy Spirit, or of walking and living in the Spirit, and of being led by and bearing the fruit of the Spirit; nothing of mystic fellowship with Christ and of a Divine image into which we are to be transformed. Nor is there aught of forensic and judicial language. But, instead, there is a simple system of sound doctrine to be learned and obeyed, there is an authoritative charge, the end or aim of which is love out of a pure heart and blameless conscience.

The very word "faith" has changed its meaning. It no longer describes a personal attitude, but, rather, either intellectually the contents of belief, or morally a pious virtue. And religion is objectified not in the manner of the ritualist as a system of observances, but in the manner of the moralist as a thing to be believed and practised. The author of the Pastorals is no man of visions and dreams or ecstasies. He is no ascetic living in rapt contemplation, remote from the ways of men, crucified to the world. Rather does he commend godliness as profitable for both worlds. Marriage, which Paul discourages, he enjoins. He loves the domestic virtues and the tranquil life. He approves the civil order. In his pages Christianity is already almost scholastic, not indeed in a dogmatic sense, but in the emphasis on knowledge and rules of administration and formal propriety, whether of worship or of conduct. But these rules of instruction are far removed from rabbinical lore, or apocalyptic passion, or the transcendentalism of personal communion with the Divine which we find in other Epistles. They are the common sense of a cosmopolitan thinker whose Gentile education has been transfigured and sanctified by the fellowship of the apostles and by faith in Christ.

We have assumed unity of authorship, but this unity has been doubted. There are variations in tone and feeling, and apparent diversities in thought or language. Thus σωτήρ, Saviour, is applied to God in 1 Tim. 1^{2} 2^{3} 4^{10}, Tit. 1^{3} 2^{10} 3^{4} (and in Luke

1^{47}, Jude ^{25}); to Christ in 2 Tim. 1^{10}, Tit. 1^{4} 2^{13} 3^{6} (and in Luke 2^{11}, Acts 5^{31} 13^{23}, and elsewhere). The double usage is found in Titus and Luke, and the fact seems to show an unstereotyped theology. The First Epistle to Timothy emphasises the humanity of Christ (2^{5}), and repeatedly uses the expression "the only God." Yet this phrase occurs twice in John, and in 1 Tim. 3^{16} the glory of Christ is supremely set forth. For practical reasons the Epistle is anti-theosophical, and any special emphasis must be due to the circumstances of the hour. In the matter of church-organisation there is a remarkable sameness between 1 Timothy and Titus; and yet some think that in the former there is a nearer approach to the idea of a single *episkopos* in the congregation (not of several, as at Ephesus and Philippi) than in the latter. The argument rests on a point of style, and seems refuted by the reference of ordination to the presbytery (1 Tim. 4^{14}). But in Titus no deacons are mentioned; and this may suggest a diversity of practice, or it may mean nothing. The theory that these two Epistles are by different authors, one of whom drew from the other, has little in its favour; and there is much to show that the three are from one mind and pen. Thus, in all, Christianity is regarded as a system of healthful doctrine, which may be styled "the truth" and "the faith." *Διδασκαλία* occurs in 1 Timothy eight times, in 2 Timothy thrice, and in Titus four times; *διδακτικός* in 1 and 2 Timothy; *διδαχή* in 2 Timothy and Titus. "Sound doctrine" occurs in 1 Timothy twice, in 2 Timothy twice,

and in Titus four times. "Teach" and "teacher," "the truth" and "the faith," occur in all; also the "word of God" and "knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις) of the truth." In the use of "the faith" there is greater variation. The term occurs ten times in 1 Timothy against twice in each of the others. Similarly Christians are "the faithful" five times in 1 Timothy and once in Titus (with thrice in *Acts* and thrice in the Exhortation Group). The form, faith "which is in Christ Jesus," occurs twice both in 1 and in 2 Timothy, but not in Titus. The preposition, unlike Paul's genitive, suggests not a relationship of personal dependence, but a system of belief which has its basis or foundation in Christ. A second group of expressions common to the three declare that this faith is "according to godliness." *Ευσέβεια*, and cognate forms occur in 1 Timothy seven times, in 2 Timothy twice, and in Titus twice (with five times in *Acts*); *ἀσέβεια* occurs once in each (and in Romans); *θεοσέβεια* in 1 Tim. 2^{10}; *σέβω* being frequent in *Acts*. These are terms of Greek piety carried over into Christianity. So with terms expressive of sobriety: *σεμνός* (or subst.) occurring four times in 1 Timothy and twice in Titus; *σώφρων* (and cognates) thrice in 1 Timothy, once in 2 Timothy, and six times in Titus. Another point common to the three is hatred of controversy or theosophical discussion. And there are many phrases and terms. Thus in the salutation we have "God the Father" instead of Paul's "our Father," and the benediction in two cases in the triple form,

"grace, mercy, and peace" (1 and 2 Timothy); the emphasis on good works, both ἔργον ἀγαθὸν and καλὰ ἔργα; the term Epiphany (of the Second Coming); such phrases as "the faithful saying," "the now age," "the healthful doctrine," "the knowledge of the truth"; such words as ἔλεος (of God), οἶκος household, νοῦς, ζήτησις, μῦθος διάβολος (slanderous), ὠφέλιμος, καθαρός and many others, to some of which we shall refer. There are thus points of community so numerous, and a harmony of teaching and discipline so complete, and a sameness of manner so unlike the other Epistles that we not only look in vain for the divergence which diversity of authorship would produce, but feel assured that an unmistakable unity of mind pervades them all.

But this newness of style, being redolent of the Grecian world, must necessarily suggest to us the one companion of Paul whom we know to have possessed the two qualifications of literary ability and Gentile birth. Our task is now, therefore, to compare these Epistles with the known characteristics of Luke. It is to be premised that a close resemblance must not be expected. Here we have a new theme and a new method. The historical books are narrative, and they largely include materials supplied. The Pastoral Epistles are didactic, and they deal not with the Galilæan life or the early preaching, but with emergent problems of the growing Gentile Church. Only incidentally in the one case, and only partially in the other, can we really expect to find the author's peculiar

characteristics. Let us examine some lines of evidence.

1. The general vocabulary. According to Findlay, out of a total of 897 words as many as 171 occur nowhere else in the N.T. Nothing, it is said, is so deceptive as facts, except figures, a paradox which this writer at once proceeds to illustrate. The point to observe is that nearly one-fifth of the words are new to the apostolic circle; and yet (as the use of a lexicon will show) that most of these are familiar to the ordinary reader of Greek. Those that do not belong to the classical masters will be found in Polybius, Diodorus, and other writers of later Greek. The inference is that the author belonged to a new circle and was familiar with the educated speech of his day. Again, there are 133 words in the Pastorals that are not found in the other Epistles assigned to Paul. If only the five more strictly Pauline are considered the number will be found to be much larger; but it is large enough to indicate that here we have not the direct work of Paul. Of these 133 not used in the Ten Epistles, 34 occur in Luke-Acts; not a very large number, it is true, but sufficient to show some connection; fairly large when we remember the diversity of purpose and material in the two sets of books. Here also let it be noted that the Pastorals contain several Latinisms (such as πρόκριμα = *prejudicium*) and perhaps references to Latin literature, which is not surprising if a native of Antioch with a Latin name, and with experience of Rome, is the author.

2. Are there any passages that show interdependence? Take 1 Timothy. In Hastings' *D.B.* five texts are given connecting this Epistle with Luke against one (a dubious one) connecting it with the other Synoptics. They are: Luke 2^{37} = 1 Tim. 5^{5}, where the pious woman is described and the common words are "supplications night and day"; Luke 9^{26} = 1 Tim. 5^{21} where the Father, the Son, and the angels are associated; Luke 10^{7} = 1 Tim. 5^{18}, "the labourer is worthy."

Here 1 Timothy agrees exactly with Luke and not with Matthew. The phrase is prominent in the *Didache* and was a maxim of the time. It is not necessary to suppose that Luke took it from Deuteronomy. Still less necessary is the Tübingen supposition that the Gospel is here quoted in a later Epistle.

Luke $12^{20.\ 21}$ = 1 Tim. 6^{17-19}, an Ebionite or anti-riches attitude; Luke 18^{30} = 1 Tim. 4^{8}, where Christianity is made profitable for both lives. Perhaps these five are not exhaustive. *Ipsissima verba* are indeed rare except in brief phrases, or notable words, such as the Johannine "eternal life," 1 Tim. 6^{12} = Acts $13^{46.\ 48}$ (or simply "life" as in 1 Tim. 6^{19}, 2 Tim. 1^{10} = Acts 3^{15} 5^{20}). The phrase indeed occurs in the three Synoptics in the story of the ruler (Luke 18^{18}); but Luke gives it also in the tempting of the lawyer (Luke $10^{25.\ 28}$). Many thoughts and phrases, however, are closely comparable. Thus 1 Tim. 1^{15} = Luke 19^{10}, where Christ's mission to earth is characterised. The special forgiveness of the ignorant appears in

1 Tim. 1^{13}, Luke 12^{48} 23^{34}, and cf. Acts 3^{17} 17^{23}. The virtue of feet-washing is memorised only in 1 Tim. 5^{10}, Luke 7^{44}. Emphasis on a purely future reward is given in 1 Tim. 6^{19}, Luke 14^{14}. In 1 Tim. 6^{15} and Luke 22^{25} kings and lordships are brought together. (Luke's *εὐεργέτης* is a virtual synonym of *σωτήρ*, and the terms are coupled as in Diod.) The combination "teach and preach" occurs in 1 Tim. 2^{7}, 2 Tim. 1^{11}, Acts 5^{42}. The term *κοινωνικός* (1 Tim. 6^{18}) might perhaps more correctly be interpreted in the light of the community of goods celebrated in Acts 2^{44} 4^{35}. Allied to it is *εὐμεταδότους*, liberal (6^{18}), which contains the lesson of Luke $6^{30.\ 35.\ 38}$. The "lifting up of hands" (1 Tim. 2^{8}) is paralleled in Luke 24^{50}, and supported by other Lucan usages. Of individual terms many are notable and suggestive, such as *ζωογονέω*, preserve alive (1 Tim. 6^{13}, Luke 17^{33}, Acts 7^{19}), *μαρτυρια* and *-έω* of character (1 Tim. 3^{17} 5^{10}, Acts 6^{3} 10^{22} 16^{2} 22^{12}). Finally, let us note that in 1 Timothy and in Luke we have the beginnings of Christian hymnology.

In 2 Timothy the same kinship may, we think, be discovered. Thus the saving efficacy of the Scriptures is stated in Luke 16^{29}, 2 Tim. 3^{15-17}. The phrase, "the Holy Ghost shall teach you," in Luke 12^{12}, 2 Tim. 4^{17}. Between 2 Tim. 1^{10} and Acts 26^{23} a very subtle connection exists; there is no imitation, but in both is presented a special conception of the gospel as charged with immortality and light. Similarly we may compare Luke 13^{27}, 2 Tim. 2^{19}, where God's knowledge of His people, and the terms "depart" and "iniquity" are brought

together. The "faithful saying," 2 Tim. 2^{11-13}, has points of similarity with what is common to Matthew and Luke 12^{9} and with elements of popular theology. Special phrases may be noted, as "filled with joy" (2 Tim. 1^{4}, Acts 13^{52}), "the quick and the dead" (2 Tim. 4^{1}, Acts 10^{42}); and terms such as ζωγρέω, catch alive (Luke 5^{10}, 2 Tim. 2^{26}), which Luke, too, delicately substitutes for "make fishers," and common ideas variously expressed, as full assurance, Luke 1^{4}, 2 Tim. 3^{14}. Of this kind is the incomplete but striking coincidence of the perfected minister described in Luke 6^{40} as κατηρτισμένος, in 2 Tim. 3^{17} as both ἄρτιος and ἐξηρτισμένος. We may also note that Stephen's prayer for his enemies has an unmistakable parallel in Paul's pity on his weak friends (2 Tim. 4^{16}, Acts 7^{60}). Again, 2 Timothy and Acts are united in the description of Christ as the righteous Judge of "quick and dead" (2 Tim. $4^{1.\ 8}$, Acts 10^{42} 17^{31}).

Passing to *Titus* we note that the incongruous quotations, "in Him we live," and "Cretans are always liars," are said to be from the same page of Epimenides (Acts 17^{28}, Tit. 1^{12}). The phrase πάντα καθαρὰ (Luke 11^{41} = Tit. 1^{15}, referred to in Rom. 14^{20}) is another instance where Luke varies from his parallels, and his addition "to you" is interpreted in Titus (cf. 1 Tim. $4^{4.\ 5}$). The combination of hope and redemption is strikingly expressed in Luke 24^{21}, Tit. $2^{13.\ 14}$ (cf. 1 Tim. 1^{1}.) With the term λυτρόω, used in these two passages, cf. Luke 1^{68} 2^{38}, Acts 7^{35} (also 1 Pet. 1^{18}, Heb. 9^{12}), and ἀντίλυτρον,

1 Tim. 2^{6}. The pouring out of the Spirit occurs in Acts 2^{17}, Tit. 3^{6}. The glory of Christ, set forth in Luke 9^{26} (though not in its parallel, Mark 8^{38}), is again specialised in Tit. 2^{13}. The combination *ἐξουσίαι ἀρχαι*, not of angels but of sublunary authorities, occurs in Luke 12^{11}, Tit. 3^{1} (cf. Rom. 13^{1}). Here also special terms may be found, such as *ἐπιφαίνω* (Tit. 2^{11} 3^{4}, Luke 1^{79}, Acts 27^{20}). And we may conclude with the assertion that the sentences, Tit. 1^{1-4}, Rom. 16^{25-27}, are assuredly from the same writer, whoever that writer may be.

Some points of a more general kind, showing the affinity of the Pastorals, may be added. Thus the very spirit of the Pastorals is expressed in Luke 8^{21} (cf. 11^{28}), where "hearing the word of God and doing it" takes the place of "doing the will of God" (Mark 3^{35}, Matt. 12^{50}), which expresses a characteristic thought of the Exhortation Group. Again, both are united in the dread of riches and the praise of poverty (see Luke's Beatitudes, or the Parable of the Rich Fool, or the warning against covetousness, or the invitation to the poor, and compare 1 Tim. $6^{10.\ 17-18}$, 2 Tim. 3^{2}). Luke 12^{21} and 1 Tim. 6^{17b} are identical in the inculcation of spiritual riches. And the very terminology in which the rich are described (1 Tim. $6^{9.\ 17}$) connects this Epistle with Luke (1^{53} 6^{24} 21^{1}). In both there is perfect universalism and no taint of racial preference. We may compare the "one Mediator," 1 Tim. 2^{5}, with the "no other name," Acts 4^{12}; or "the Spirit saith expressly," 1 Tim. 4^{1}, with "the Holy Ghost said,"

Acts 13^3, and often. The ecclesiastical organisation in Acts and the Pastorals corresponds: this includes the identity of elder and bishop. The term *πρεσβυτέριον* occurs only in 1 Tim. 4^{13}, Luke 22^{66}, Acts 22^5 (the latter two being non-Christian). Other points are the laying on of hands, and the term "evangelist." Terms of knowledge are common to all, and in Luke we may note "knowledge of salvation" and the "key of knowledge" (1^{77} 11^{52}). In both groups there is an underlying element of Greek speech or method or ways of thinking; and we may again instance the use of *σωτήρ*, the semi-scholastic idea of moral discipline, the compounds of *σέβομαι*, frequent in Acts and Pastorals, and the figurative use of *οἶκος*. Points of contact with the poets are frequent. The term "widow" occurs only in Luke-Acts and the Pastorals. Luke refers to women more often and more sympathetically than any other (cf. 2 Tim. 1^5); the name Pontius is given in Luke 3^1, Acts 4^{27}, 1 Tim. 6^{13}, but also in Matt. 27^2. It belongs to no other Epistle, and it reminds us of Luke's general attention to such points.

3. Let us next inquire regarding what is to be expected in the work of Luke—the use of medical terminology. In 1 Tim. 4^2 we have a term "seared with a hot iron," which was technically used of a method of amputation; in 1 Tim. 6^4 the term "morbid"; in 5^{23} the term *ἀσθενείας*, translated infirmities, but used for "diseases" in Luke 5^{15} 8^2, Acts 28^9 (and Matt. 8^{17}). In 2 Tim. 2^{17} we have "gangrene" (or cancer); and perhaps the accom-

panying term *νομή* (used by Polybius of ulcers) has also medical associations; in 2 Tim. 4^3, "itching ears"—the phrase is explained in Hesychius, and in Aristotle the verb is used medically of ulcers. These are the most definite, but others point in the same direction. Thus *ὀδύνη*, pain, occurs only in 1 Tim. 6^{10}, Rom. 9^2; the corresponding verb being found only in Luke 2^{48} 16^{24}, Acts 20^{38}. The term *ἄνοια*, stupidity (2 Tim. 3^9), is used of insanity in Luke 6^{11} (and in Herodotus); *φρεναπάτης* (Tit. 1^{10}, cf. Gal. 6^3) has a similar suggestiveness; and *σωφροσύνη* (1 Tim. 2^{15}), with its more frequent cognates, has in classical Greek the technical meaning of sanity. Figurative usages occur. Thus *ὑγιαίνων*, sound (whence hygiene), occurs in all. The verb *ἐντρέφω*, nourish (1 Tim. 4^6), used of the mind, is employed by Galen in the same phrase as here. *Ἐκτρέπω* appears four times in the Pastorals and in Heb. 12^{13}: the former cases follow meanings in Xenophon and Polybius, but the latter, "put out of joint," is a special usage of the physician's, and shows the medical associations of the word. Doubtless there are other semi-technical terms. It seems fair to add that many of the precepts—the recommendation of all meats (1 Tim. $4^{3.4}$), and of marriage (4^4 5^{14}), and of "a little wine" (5^{23}), and of bodily exercise (4^8), the inculcations of sobriety, the impatience of speculative "science falsely so called" (6^{20}), or of learners that learn nothing (2 Tim. 3^7), the general descriptions of vice, and even such touches as "oft refreshed" (2 Tim. 1^{16}), or "washed the saints' feet" and "relieved the afflicted" (1 Tim. 5^{10}),

are such as would be natural to a wise physician. We may add the reference to child-bearing (1 Tim. 2^{15}), the advice to widows, such epithets as *βλαβέρας*, 1 Tim. 6^{9} (similarly used in Xenophon), *δεδουλωμένας*, enslaved (to wine) (Tit. 2^{3}), *μεμιαμμένοις*, (inwardly) defiled (Tit. 1^{15}), and many others descriptive of the ruinous effects of evil conduct. Most important of all is the sentence (1 Tim. 5^{23}) where parental regard and medical instinct seem combined, and where three terms, *ὑδροπότει*, *στόμαχον*, *ἀσθενίας*, seem suggestive of professional experience. And in view of this tender care we may ask who but Luke (of all known to us as possible authors) knew the circumstances of Timothy's boyhood and education, and of his home and mother and grandmother? The references to these, and to Paul's persecutions in Galatia (2 Tim. 3^{11}), are intelligible and luminous if we suppose that it was during the First Missionary Journey (on which Luke was an unnamed companion) that this important friendship was formed.

4. Less conclusive as to authorship, but not less important, are evidences of familiarity with the religious ideas of Greece. The author was not a Jew. He speaks of Jewish fables (Tit. 1^{14}), not only to distinguish them from Gentile, but to convey contempt. He acknowledges that the O.T. may make men wise unto salvation, provided that it is used in subordination to faith in Christ (2 Tim. 3^{15}). He does not quote from the O.T. or build arguments on its words. Nor does he base teaching on Greek literature, though here and there we come on a classic reminiscence (as in the phrase

"fight the good fight," from the *Alcestis* of Euripides), and once we encounter a hexameter verse (Tit. 1^{12}). In his descriptions of God, the most notable expression is God-Father (or Father-God), which occurs in all. Again, there is the "great God" (Mahadeva), Tit. 2^{13}. The epithet *ἀψευδής* (Tit. 1^{2}) goes back to Hesiod. *Δυνάστης* (1 Tim. 6^{15}) is applied by Sophocles to Zeus, and the same sentence contains the epithet "unapproachable," which belongs to many of the Greek thinkers. Greek habits of thought may be traced in the descriptions *μόνος* (1 Tim. 1^{17}. $6^{15.\ 16}$), King of the æons (1^{17}), *μακάριος*, blessed (1^{11} 6^{15}) (= *μάκαρες* in Homer and Hesiod), and the quickener (or preserver alive) of all things (6^{13}). To the same influence may be due *Σωτήρ*, and also the vacillation with which it is applied. The combination, "myths and genealogies" (found in Polybius), 1 Tim. 1^{4}, cf. Tit. 3^{9}, is supposed to refer to the Gnostic speculations that then filled the pagan world and affected also the Jewish. The term *ἐπιφάνεια*, which is here used of the Second Coming, was familiar to the Greeks of the advent of a God, though it occurs also in 2 Maccabees. *Παλιγγενεσία* (Tit. 3^{5}) was an idea of Pythagoras and of the Stoics; as were also *ἀνακαινώσις* (Tit. 3^{5}) and the "restitution of all things" of *Acts* 3^{21}. The adjectives *ὅσιος* and *καθαρός* were characteristic of the Orphic and Pythagorean sects. *Ὅσιος* occurs twice in the Pastorals, once in Luke, and thrice in Acts (also in Heb. 7^{26}, Eph. 4^{24}, 1 Thess. 2^{16}). *Καθαρός* is used in its ethical sense five times in the Pastorals and twice in *Acts*; in its ceremonial sense

in Tit. 1^{15}, Luke 11^{41} (and Rom. 14^{20}). The verb *καθαρίζω* is used ceremonially in Acts 10^{15} 11^{9}, and ethically in Acts 15^{9}, Tit. 2^{14} (and in the Exhortation Group and in James). It is remarkable that such words are never found in the five Epistles of Paul. The adjective *καλός* is used in the Pastorals twenty-five times; of which a goodly proportion show the most classical sense. The virtue of piety is expressed in Greek terms (*εὐσέβεια*, etc.), and the higher expression, *θεοσέβεια* (1 Tim. 2^{10}), is found in Xenophon and Plato as well as in the Septuagint. In the strictly ethical sphere there are many terms that seem to breathe the atmosphere of Stoicism. Such are *σώφρων* (eight times), *ἐγκρατής* (Tit. 1^{8}), *ἐπιεικής* (1 Tim. 3^{3}, Tit. 3^{2}), *αὐτάρκεια* (1 Tim. 6^{6}), *ὑπομονή* (once in each), *σεμνότης*. Blamelessness is expressed by such terms as *ἄσπιλον* (1 Tim. 6^{14}), *ἀνέγκλητος* (1 Tim. 3^{10}, Tit. 1^{6}), *ἀνεπίλημπτον* (1 Tim. 3^{2} 5^{7} 6^{14}, the last two of which are thoroughly Greek); as is also *βέβηλος*, profane (1 Tim. 1^{9} 4^{7} 6^{20}, 2 Tim. 2^{16}, cf. Heb. 12^{16}, Acts 24^{6}, Matt. 12^{5}). A comparison of *ἀνεπίλημπτον* in 1 Timothy with *ἐπιλαμβάνω* in Luke $20^{20.\ 26}$ might be sufficient to suggest unity of authorship.

There are other terms of a semi-philosophical kind, some of which are given in (6); terms also of popular Greek religion, such as "calling on the Lord" (*τὸν κύριον*, 2 Tim. 2^{22}), instead of the usual Hebrew idiom, "the name of the Lord." We are thus led to the opinion that the author of the Pastorals was not only a physician, but, like our own Sir Thomas Browne, a man of extensive reading,

of curious observation, of wide sympathy, and of literary power. It is remarkable that of the supposed connections between Paul and Seneca, four are with 1 Timothy, one with 2 Timothy, and one with Titus; also four with (Acts 17) the speech at Athens. Slight connections also may be imagined with Philo, who, *e.g.*, uses the phrase "true riches," and has maxims of ethics that the author of the Pastorals may have studied. Once more we may go back to what is known of Antisthenes, the founder of the cynical school; his emphasis on the unity of God, the sufficiency of virtue, the necessity of teaching, and the saying, "Man's true life consisteth not in his possessions but in his soul" (cf. Luke 12^{15}, or the "life indeed" of 1 Tim. 6^{19}).

5. The chief remaining argument is in the use of words in detail. This we indicate in three ways.

(*a*) There are favourite words. Take *παραγγέλλω, παραγγελία.* The subst. occurs emphatically in 1 Tim. $1^{5.\,18}$, and in Acts 5^{28} 16^{24}; the verb in 1 Tim. 1^{3} 4^{11} 5^{7} $6^{13.\,17}$, and fifteen times in Luke-Acts; also four times in 2 Thess. 3, twice in Matthew, once in Mark, and twice in 1 Corinthians. The interesting thing to note is that in Luke 5^{14} 8^{56} 9^{21} this verb is inserted where the parallels (Matt. 8^{14}, Mark 5^{43}, Matt. 16^{20}) have a different word, and that again in Mark 3^{12}, Matt. 9^{30} 12^{16} 17^{9} 16^{20}, the same meaning is expressed, but always otherwise. But it is equally remarkable that these terms connect only one of the Pastorals with the Lucan histories. Take *φυλάσσω*, guard or keep. This term is frequent in Acts; it belongs to no Epistle

except 1 and 2 Timothy, and it occurs in the Gospels only in the story of the rich young man. The phrase "keep the law" is in 1 Tim. 5^{21}, Acts 7^{53} 16^{4} 21^{24} (and Gal. 6^{13}); "guard the deposit," in 1 Tim. 6^{20}, 2 Tim. $1^{12.\ 14}$. There is also a usage of the middle voice, "guard against," in Luke 12^{15}, Acts 21^{25}, and 2 Tim. 4^{15}. A term of similar meaning is *προσέχω*, with dat. = take heed. It occurs in 1 Tim. 1^{4} 3^{8} 4^{13}, Tit. 1^{14}, and in Luke often; with *ἑαυτοῖς* five times. So *ἐπέχω* with dat. occurs in 1 Tim. 4^{16}, Acts 3^{5}; while *παρέχω* (exhibit, etc.) occurs seven times in Luke-Acts, twice in 1 Timothy, and once in Titus. Terms of *soldiering* are frequent in Luke. In the Pastorals we have *στρατεύω*, 1 Tim. 1^{18}, 2 Tim. 2^{4}, *στρατειά*, 1 Tim. 1^{18}, *στρατιώτης*, 2 Tim. 2^{3}, *στρατολόγεω*, 2 Tim. 2^{4} (cf. also 1 Cor. 9^{7}, 2 Cor. $10^{3.\ 4}$). The virtue *ὑπομονή*, 1 Tim. 6^{11}, 2 Tim. 3^{10}, Tit. 2^{2} is introduced into Luke 12^{48} 23^{46}, though it is not in the parallels. The adjective *ἄξιος* with gen. occurs in 1 Timothy four times, in Luke-Acts six times (and in Rom. 1^{32}). *Ἀναλαμβάνω* in the sense of "take" occurs in 2 Tim. 4^{11}, Acts 20^{13} 23^{31}; in the sense of "take up," of the Ascension, in 1 Tim. 3^{16} and in Acts $1^{2.\ 11.\ 22}$, 10^{16} (and Mark 16^{19}). The verb *ἀποδέχομαι* occurs eight times in Luke-Acts, and nowhere else, but the noun *ἀποδοχή* belongs to 1 Tim. 1^{15}, 4^{9}. *Βίος*, life, occurs in 1 Tim. 2^{2}, 2 Tim. 2^{4}, Luke 8^{14}, but the adjective is in Luke 21^{34}, and *βίωσις* in Acts 26^{4}; and again 2 Tim. 2^{4} is vitally connected with *πραγματεύσασθαι*, Luke 19^{13}. *Ζήτησις* occurs four times in the Pastorals and twice in Acts;

but *ζήτημα* is found five times in Acts. *Δεήσεις*, prayers, belongs to Luke and the Pastorals. *Διαλογισμός*, reasoning, occurs four times in Luke and in 1 Tim. 2^{8} (the use in Mark is different). *Ἐφίστημι* occurs in Luke-Acts eighteen times, but elsewhere only in 2 Tim. $4^{2.6}$ (and 1 Thess. 5^{3}).

(*b*) Some idioms or adverbial phrases.

πλεῖον or *ἐπι πλεῖον*, 2 Tim. 2^{16} 3^{9}, Luke-Acts five times.

εἰς το μέλλον, 1 Tim. 6^{19}, Luke 13^{9}.

μάλιστα, 1 Timothy thrice, 2 Tim. 4^{13}, Tit. 1^{10}, Acts thrice (also Gal. 6^{10}, Phil. 4^{22}, Philem. ^{16} 2 Pet. 2^{11}).

χάριν prepositionally, 1 Tim. 5^{14}, Tit. $1^{5.11}$, Luke 7^{47} (Gal. 3^{10}, Eph. $3^{1.44}$); cf. general meanings of *χάρις* in Luke-Acts.

δι ἣν αἰτίαν, wherefore, 2 Tim. $1^{6.12}$, Tit. 1^{13}, Luke 8^{47} (Heb. 2^{11}); *αἰτία* being frequent in Acts.

τίς, *τίνες* substantively, six times in 1 Timothy, ten times in Luke-Acts, and occasionally elsewhere.

Uses also of *ὅσος* and *ὅστις*: *e.g.* *ὅσα* = *quam multa*, only in 2 Tim. 1^{18} and thrice in Luke-Acts.

The repetition of the article after the subst. (as in *ἡ πίστις ἡ*, 1 Tim. 2^{13}, 2 Tim. 1^{13} 3^{15}, Acts 26^{18}) seems to be observed chiefly in the Pastorals and Luke.

Uses of prepositions. Thus *κατὰ πόλιν*, in every city, Tit. 1^{5}, twice in Luke, twice in Acts (and Thucydides).

The construction not . . . but, in 1 Tim. 2^{9-10}, Luke $14^{12.13}$.

εἰμί with gen., am of the number of, 1 Tim. 1^{20}, 2 Tim. 1^{15}, Acts 23^{6}; with ἐν, engaged in, 1 Tim. 4^{15}, Luke 2^{49}.

ἔχω impersonally, 1 Tim. 5^{25}, Acts five times.

ἀνέχω with gen., endure, 2 Tim. 4^{3}, Acts 18^{14}.

ὁ νῦν αἰών, in all the Pastorals (written in Romans thrice with καιρός, cf. Acts 21^{1}, Gal. 4^{26}). Various uses of νῦν in Luke-Acts.

In this connection also may be noted the frequency of verbs with single and sometimes with double prefixes. There are also what may be called compounds. Thus we have in Tit. 2^{3} ἱεροπρεπής, and in Acts 19^{37} ἱερόσυλος; in Titus φιλανθρωπία, with many other φιλ's, and in Acts φιλανθρώπως with others. Common to both sides is φιλάργυρος. We have also ὀρθοτομέω (2 Tim. 2^{15}), κενοφωνία (1 and 2 Tim.), οἰκοδεσποτέω (1 Tim. 5^{14}), and others, all easily paralleled in Luke.

(*c*) The general terms of the Epistles are of very various complexion. Some belong to the whole N.T., some are very rare, some connect the Pastorals with later Greek from Polybius onward, and some connect the Pastorals with Luke-Acts, and in most of these cases with the earlier historians. Of this fourth kind we give a few examples:—

Belonging to the five (and to Hebrews) we have παραιτέομαι, παιδεύω, and the figurative use of οἶκος.

In Titus we note ἀντίλεγω, νοσφίζω, σωτήριος, πειθαρχέω, νομικὸς, χρεία, πρεσβύτης, προσδέχομαι = wait.

In 1 Timothy we have *ἐπιταγή* (cf. in Luke-Acts, *ἐπιτάσσω*), *προσμείνω*, *ἐπιμελέομαι*, *ἀφίστημι*, *παρακολουθέω*, *μελετάω*, *σωματικὴ*, *περίεργος*, *περιέρχομαι*, *κατηγορία*, *πυκνός*, *ὑπόνοια*, *βυθίζω*, *δυνάστης*, *εὐεργεσιά*, *ἀντιλαμβάνω*, *ζωογονέω*, *ἱματισμός*.

In 2 Timothy, *ζωγρέω*, *ἀχάριστος*, *προδότης*, *προπέτης*, *ἄνοια*, *ἐφίστημι*. Others are *προ κόπτω* (cf. Galatians and Philippians), *στερεὸς*, which occurs in Acts and in the Exhortation Group, *ἐπιτιμάω*, which is in all the Synoptics.

Some may be specially emphasised. Thus *παρατίθεμαι* (Mid. "commend") appears in 1 Tim. 1^{18}, 2 Tim. 2^{2}, and twice both in Luke and in Acts —a term of Xen., Polyb., Diod.; *ἀντίκειμαι* with dat. occurs in 1 Tim. 1^{10}, Luke 13^{17} 21^{15} (and in Galatians); *παγίς*, a snare, 1 Tim. 3^{7} 6^{9}, 2 Tim. 2^{26}, is used by Luke (21^{35}) of the Second Coming, either in mistranslation or as a familiar idea; the plur. *ἡδοναὶ*, occurs in Tit. 3^{3}, Luke 8^{14} (and James); *κοινός* = common, is used in Tit. 1^{4}, Acts twice (and Jude). From *ἀργύροιν*, frequent in Luke-Acts, we have *αργύρεος*, 2 Tim. 2^{20}, Acts 19^{24}, *φιλάργυρος*, 2 Tim. 3^{2}, Luke 16^{14}, and *φιλαργυρία*, 1 Tim. 6^{10}. *Ἐπιθυμέω* with gen. occurs in 1 Tim. 3^{1}, Acts 20^{33}; *πιστεύω* with dat., 2 Tim. 1^{12}, Tit. 3^{8}, and with *ἐπι*, 1 Tim. 1^{16}—constructions frequent in Acts. From *νοῦς* we have *ὑπόνοια*, 1 Tim. 6^{4}, *ὑπονοίω*, Acts thrice; *ἄνοια*, 2 Timothy and Luke, *ἀνόητος*, 1 Tim. 6^{9}, Tit. 3^{3}, Luke 24^{25} (also Romans and Galatians). The comparative *νεώτερος* appears thrice in Luke-Acts, thrice in 1 Timothy, and once in Titus (and in John and in 1 Peter). Cf. also its opposite, *πρεσβύ-*

τερος; and also the positive thereof, Luke 1^{18}, Tit. $2^{2.3}$.

6. It is proper to add that the Pastorals contain several words not found in Luke-Acts, and most of them not elsewhere in the N.T. Questions will arise as to whether these are due to novelty of subject, or to some other authorship, or whether they may not really confirm the Lucan theory. Some go back to the classic period. Thus ἐκτρέπω (four times in Pastorals and once in Hebrews) belongs to general Greek literature; but its medical association is suggestive: ἐντρέφω is used in Plato and in Philo; κοσμικός in Aristotle; γενεαλογία in Plato and in Polybius; παραθήκη, ὠφέλιμος, and ἀνωφελής from Plato onwards; several ethical terms: ἀμοιβή, perhaps taken from Euripides; ἀναζωπυρέω, in Xenophon. Others are of later Greek, found in Polybius or in Plutarch: as ἀστοχέω, 1 Tim. 1^6 6^{21}, 2 Tim. 2^{18}; διαβεβαιόομαι, 1 Tim. 1^7, Tit. 3^8; περιίστασο, 2 Tim. 2^{16}, Tit. 3^9; μεσίτης, 1 Tim. 2^5 (and Hebrews thrice); ἀγωγή, 2 Tim. 3^{10}; ἔντευξις, 1 Tim. 2^1 4^5; ἀνυπότακτος, 1 Tim. 1^9, Tit. $1^{6.10}$ (and Hebrews); ἀπρόσιτον, 1 Tim. 6^{16}; γραώδης, 1 Tim. 4^7 (in Strabo); ματαιολογία (in Plutarch) and ὑγιαίνων, in its figurative use (so found in Philo and Plutarch). Are they not the exceptions that confirm the conclusion?

Another point which contains some slight argumentative value may be named. A certain connection exists (as was admitted in patristic times) between Luke and Hebrews; a certain connection can be shown to exist between the

Pastorals and Hebrews; hence we may conclude a connection between Luke and the Pastorals. Of the connections of the Pastorals and Hebrews are terms, as Mediator, *Didache*, παιδεύω, and a considerable list of unusual words; and phrases as "knowledge of the truth," and "abolished death" (2 Tim. 1^{10}, cf. Heb. 2^{14}), and the figure of the Race (which in Heb. 12^{1-2} seems based on 2 Tim. 4^{7}). Similarly, indeed, terms of the Pastorals (such as ἀναστροφή, καλα ἔργα, ἐπιεικέσιν, ξενίσθε, παρα τιθέσθωσαν) appear in 1 Peter, while again a direct connection seems to exist between 1 Pet. 5^{2} and Acts 20^{28}, where the work of the elder is said to be pastoral, or between 1 Pet. 2^{12} and Luke 19^{44} in the reference to the "time of visitation." But the argument which would thus connect the Pastorals and Acts or Luke would be unsafe. The truth is that many of Luke's words have found their way into all the Exhortation Group, partly from personal intercourse, partly from a common knowledge of apocryphal and recent literature, and partly from the growth (as a result of missionary work) of a common Christian vocabulary. These points of terminological connection between the second and fourth groups are an interesting, but for the present superfluous, problem.

Thus various lines of argument converge to one conclusion; and the general situation becomes intelligible. It is not for a moment imaginable that Paul, with his Hebraic spirit, his faith of Christ, his reliance on the O.T., his experience of visions,

his theology of Atonement, his mystic fellowship and life in the Spirit, his conception of conduct as created from the inner impulses of faith and love, could have written these three moral charges with their categories of duties, and have written them in a new terminology. But the diversity that seemed to many to require two or three generations for its growth is now easily explicable. Paul's writings have behind them the history of Israel and his own agony; Luke's, the general education of his time and the triumphant advance of the new religion. Paul's mind was exercised with the Cross (not mentioned in the Pastorals) and the Resurrection; Luke's with the instruction of the people in uprightness and godliness. The training of the one was rabbinical, of the other liberal. The one was a pioneer and master-builder, the other a continuer and promoter of things in progress. Differences in natural powers, in mental training, in habits of thought, in circumstances of life, and in rapidly changing environments sufficiently account for the differing result. Nor does there seem to be any text that requires for the Pastorals a late date. Some have found in 1 Tim. 2^6 (as in 1 John 4^2) evidence of an existing docetism. But it must be remembered that in epochs of ferment and creative power every possible opinion may take sudden and early shape. Again, the Gnostic speculations glanced at in these Epistles—the genealogies and theories of angels or æons, the corruptions of matter, the impurities of meats, the scorn of marriage—are things not of the second century or

the Græco-Asiatic world only, but of an epoch of centuries receding behind history and beyond the limits of the Empire. They would naturally assert themselves (as did the exorcists) in instant opposition to the nascent faith. Some again find in these Epistles a late ecclesiastical organisation. One sees episcopacy in the references to bishops, *i.e.* to pastors and presbyters. Another finds it in the authority commended to Timothy and Titus—though such authority must have belonged to every active founder and every efficient superintendent in that stage of the Gentile world. The Pastorals are parallel with the Acts. The situation and equipment are the same. And if, following Harnack, advanced criticism accepts the Lucan authorship of the latter, it can find no ground, in respect of Church government, for a later date of the former; nor in the sphere of Church life. For the details of reading and prayer and constancy of instruction are such as would be given in the earliest days; while the greater fulness of 1 Timothy, its hymnal outburst, its three faithful sayings, its greater extent and variety of activity, enable us to mark the lines of progress and to place before our eyes the form of a growing Church.

We are now in a better position for considering the occasion or purpose of the Epistles, and the aspects of Christianity which they perpetuate. The Second to Timothy is the first of the three; first in time and nearest in thought to the mind of Paul.

It is his dying message; and may have been written either in his presence or in accordance with his last instructions. The personal references have every appearance of personal knowledge. Some have supposed that there was an original short letter (containing 4^{16-18}) which is incorporated. A possible opinion is that the Epistle was in substance dictated. Most probably Luke wrote just after the martyrdom, partly to record last words and messages, partly to memorise a solemn occasion, but mainly to throw on Timothy the burden of the succession and to invest him with a portion of the mantle. Paul suffered (Clement tells us) under the prætorian prefects—later therefore than the death of Burrus (62 A.D.) who held the office alone. Our Epistle was probably written in 63, some weeks, or perhaps months, after the letter to Philippi. When the trial came on, the prospects were so grave that no fellow-countryman or co-religionist stood by the apostle (4^{16}). Luke alone remained. Timothy was doubtless on tour (Phil. 2^{19}); and more recently, Tychicus, Titus, and Crescens had been despatched (2 Tim. 4^{10}). There are indeed in Rome Christians from whom compliments can be sent (4^{21}). But in the hour of trial the strengthener is Christ. The adjourned or second hearing is at hand, and the triumph of the enemy is anticipated. What changed the former hopeful prospect (Phil. 2^{24}) and darkened the situation, the biographer here (as in *Acts*) has hidden from our view. The same term for death, ἀνάλυσις, is repeated and the same figure of a libation

(Phil. 1^{23} 2^{17}, 2 Tim. 4^{6}). The Epistle, thus diversified with personal reference and mournful reminiscence, is in substance a final charge to the young evangelist to use his gifts faithfully, holding firmly to the sound doctrine and bracing himself vigorously for life's warfare. He is required to discourage controversy, to be gentle and prudent amid opposition, to reprove with long-suffering, to keep the apostle's example before him, to be energetic and unresting, and so to fulfil his ministry and service. The letter is throughout an appeal; not an "exhortation," but a putting in remembrance and a setting forth of duty. To the ministers of Christ has been committed a sacred trust, a system of faith and doctrine to be zealously guarded, kept pure, realised in practice and handed on to the succeeding ages. The Christian is a soldier or labourer who has to endure hardness, and may have to suffer distress. He is also subject to infirmity, and must remember the high ideal. But if he keep the faith he will receive the crown.

One special point: the note of coming troubles. There are the evils of fruitless speculation, "profane babblings," the effect of which is to disturb men's faith (2^{16-18}). There are the more terrible evils of lawlessness, where the form of godliness is shown without the power (3^{1-8}). The man of God must be orthodox in doctrine and upright in character; and while he is required to be a model of gentleness and forbearance, he must yet "reprove, rebuke, and exhort" ($2^{15.\ 22.\ 24}$ 3^{10} 4^{2-5}). Now these semi-prophetic passages are precisely

the ground on which critics contend for a late date. Such language (they say) belongs not to anticipation, but to observation; they are prophecies after the event. Yet it is likely enough that such anticipations were often on Paul's lips; and that to the calm clear eye of Luke this painful trend was in many a city obvious enough. Moreover, the words of 1 Tim. 4^1 seem to interpret not an individual opinion but the growing conviction of the Church. There is nothing surprising in the utterance of these words in 63, but whoever prefers it may believe that the letter was originally shorter and more personal, and that it was afterwards expanded for the benefit of all evangelists.

The other two Epistles—1 Timothy and Titus —are in design more or less parallel. The persons addressed are quasi-apostolic officers delegated to superintend a city or a province. Timothy is not now an "evangelist," still less a bishop (which was a stage lower), but is a commissioner charged to assume something of apostolic authority. The fundamental direction given him concerns the correct apprehension of Christianity. A second time he is told that it is not a theosophical but a practical religion. The end of the charge is charity, and the work of Christ is to save sinners ($1^{5.\ 15}$). This being premised, suggestions are made regarding the guidance of churches. Two subjects are dealt with—the conduct of public worship and the appointment of local agents. The former includes the objects and manner of public prayer

and the place and bearing of women. Incidentally the writer shows his respect for the powers that be, and his love of the quiet tranquil life. The house (= household) of God is styled the "church of the living God." And these words (which denote the congregation, not the building) show how deeply Paul's conception of a Church of God has laid hold of the minds of his associates. But the additional words, "pillar and ground of the truth," now usually misunderstood, seem intended to describe the leading member of the community (3^{15}, cf. Gal. 2^{9}, Rom. 3^{12}). The officers specified in 1 Timothy are the bishops (or elders), deacons, and elderly useful widows. In Titus there is no mention of the last two, or of the presbytery; but there is no reason to doubt that deacons, deaconesses, and presbytery are older than either Epistle, whatever may have been the stage of development in Crete. The qualifications of these classes are given in similar terms in both Epistles (1 Tim. 3^{1-13}, Tit. 1^{5-9}). It is disputed whether in 1 Timothy a distinction is made between bishops and deacons, and in Titus between bishops and elders. The deacon has a different and perhaps lower office, but the qualifications are virtually the same. As to bishop and elder there is the peculiar fact, of which the most is made, that the former term is used only in the singular while the latter is both singular and plural (1 Tim. 3^{2} $5^{1.\ 17}$, Tit. $1^{5.\ 7}$). It is the plural "bishops" that is used in Phil. 1^{1}, Acts 20^{28}. Here it is perhaps an accident of style: "elders . . . if any man is blameless . . . for the

bishop . . ." (Tit. $1^{5.\ 6.\ 7}$). Somewhat similarly, in 1 Tim. 5^{1}, we have the singular "elder" followed by two plurals—*νεωτέρους*, *πρεσβυτέρας*—on which, however, no one has cared to base a doctrine of mono-eldership. And in 1 Tim. 3^{1} the singular "bishop" naturally follows the abstract noun *ἐπισκοπή*; being, clearly, used representatively. And the references to the payment of elders, and to the respect due to them, 1 Tim. $5^{17.\ 19}$, seem to confirm the view that they were the highest officers. As we know from Clement that the identity of elder and bishop still existed at the close of the century, we need not be surprised that some advanced critics have endeavoured to see in this Epistle what they could regard as a sure sign of second century origin.

The paragraphs that follow are mainly personal—on the duties of life and service. It belongs to Timothy's office to "read, exhort, and teach" (4^{13}), to stir up his ministerial gifts, and by continuous diligence make visible progress. He must be prudent and impartial, avoiding disputation and repudiating worldliness ($6^{4.\ 9.\ 10}$). Godliness alone is profitable (4^{8} 6^{6}). The commandment must be kept entire, and the onward course pursued until the coming of Christ (6^{12-14}). Similarly in Titus, with fewer references to agencies in the Church or wickedness in the world or forebodings of the future, he tells this other son in the faith how to speak and act and guide and rule.

These Epistles, then, belong to the time when the apostolic founders have just passed away, and

on surviving disciples the duty is laid of preserving, by organisation and discipline, the work that has been inaugurated. The edifice whose foundations are laid must be reared; the ground won for Christ must be held and extended. Hence the teaching and the wholesome doctrine and the moral exhortation. Hence also the second characteristic of these Epistles, the deep distrust of speculation. Error was in the air. Christianity was in contact with theosophies, with the cult and the practices and the pretensions of Gnosticism. By these theorisings and theosophisings many Christians would be fascinated. But in the author of the Pastorals we see one who stood near the opposite extreme, unendowed perhaps on the metaphysical or mystic sides, and fearful lest by such dallying with sacred themes the purity of the faith might be endangered. It is likely enough also that Timothy, who is addressed, had secret leanings towards the "science falsely so called," and that the repeated warnings show the overfondness of an elder friend who now takes the paternal place of the apostle. At the same time the letters are to be read in the larger light of literature; that is to say, not merely as private communications to individuals, but as messages to the rising generation—as appeals to the makers of the future to adhere to the faith once delivered, and to the type of life and doctrine presented to them in the consecrated career and illuminated teaching of the apostolic founder. The Pastoral Epistles contain, with somewhat that is less attractive, much that is singularly beautiful. The

author has learned the secret of Jesus, and he knows the right meaning of life. But he is not an original creative thinker, with enlarging views of the problems of knowledge, or with fresh ethical principles that open up new vistas of personal or social duty. His distinction is that he brought the best of Hellenism alongside of the apostolic Hebraism, and made the culture of the world subservient to the cause of Christ.

Two main types of error are in the writer's mind, a speculative gnosis and a non-Christian asceticism. These indeed in varying degrees and forms are commonplaces of the immemorial East. There was in the first century both a Jewish and a Gentile gnosis. In Titus it is the Jewish that is expressly scorned; for whichever was the more important, it was the Jewish (at least in Crete, though in Ephesus it might be different) that was most likely to affect the early Church. The asceticism was vegetarian and celibate, and to a practical physician noxious. But critics overestimate the importance of slight allusions. And again, they fail to discern the personal equation. The author is by temperament practical, non-theological, anti-controversial. He admires the domestic and the tranquil life. By temperament, also, he is opposed to the accumulation or the passion of wealth, in which he sees not only a moral danger but also the abatement of the primitive fervour. Therefore he commends contentment and sobriety. But he would have done so in any age. Yet the strong language which he uses of those so-called errorists—seducing

spirits and doctrines of demons and lying hypocrisy —implies something more than diversity of opinion or unprofitableness of theory. The cult which he condemns must have shown itself opposed to the new moral life of Christianity; and, like the theosophies and occultism of to-day, may have been specially organised to thwart the progress of the gospel. In any case the writer's problem is no longer Paul's. It is no longer the racial repugnance of Jew and Gentile, with the care of tender consciences and the requirements of expediency, but the general sense of the community on the one side against sectarians, faddists, and degenerates on the other. And the author falls back on the first principles of reason and religion. "Every creation of God is good, provided it is received with thanksgiving and sanctified with prayer." There is an acceptable spirit, and there is a spirit of perversity. To the pure all things are pure. Defilement is of the mind.

In a world where error and evil so abound, the Christian flock has to be guarded. The Pastorals are letters parallel in purpose and harmonious in spirit with the more general manual of the time known as the *Didache*. There also Christianity is mainly ethical; and ecclesiastical organisation and activity are approved. There in the ways of life and death was embodied the kind of teaching which the minister was required both to practise and to inculcate. He must "hold the faithful word which is, according to the *Didache*, that he may be able both to exhort in the sound doctrine and to convict the

gainsayers" (Tit. 1^{9}). There is the situation in a sentence. The system of moral instruction which the Jews had practised for centuries, and of which we have memorials in their books of Wisdom, is now being applied to heathen converts who have behind them scarcely anything of the kind. The Church leaders are struggling on the one hand to defend their faith against the pagan controversialist, and on the other hand to free the infant Church from the throttling chains of vice; and they hold before the eyes of the people the paths of virtue and the prospect of an immortality of bliss.

Finally, let us consider the implicit or underlying theology. First, as to the doctrine of God. Here we miss the close personal relationship felt by Paul, manifested in Jesus. God is not "our" Father, but "the" Father. The conceptions are great, but they do not rest on subjective experience, on a consciousness of adoption, or the sense of an inward presence, an indwelling power. The spirit does not cry, Abba! it is a spirit of love and sobering. The writer's enthusiasm is for "good works."

The Father is great and blessed, the one, the only, the living God, life-begetter of all things; King of kings and of the ages, and Lord of every lordship; alone in power and immortality, invisible, inaccessible, imperishable (1 Tim. 1^{17} 2^{5} 3^{15} 4^{10} $6^{13.\ 15.\ 16}$). He shows mercy and favour, is kind and philanthropic, is the Saviour, especially of the faithful, and wishes all to be saved (1 Tim. 1^{11} 2^{4} 4^{10} 6^{15}, Tit. 3^{4}). Such expressions, where philosophic grandeur is combined with emphasis on mercy,

show the author's distinctiveness; and in his whole conception of God as the source of life and power, incomparable and unapproachable, blessed and gracious, we have a body of Græco-Christian thought not unworthy to be placed beside the exalted conceptions of the Isaianic prophecies. Along with the greatness there is also a true sense of the nearness of God. Such expressions as "the man of God," "the house of God," "the word of God"; such ideas as God's philanthropy or man's stewardship, show the fullest consciousness of Christianity as a revelation, and of God as fulfilling His purposes towards men.

The name CHRIST JESUS occurs about twenty times; "Jesus Christ" and "the Lord Jesus Christ" less frequently; "Christ" only once. The title "the Lord" is very frequent in 2 Timothy, where the immediate influence of Paul is felt, but is rare elsewhere. So far, and in the coupling of Christ with God in the opening salutations, Paul's manner is, in general, adhered to. Titus also couples the names in the possession of heavenly glory and in the bringing of salvation. The pre-existence of Christ is implied in 2 Tim. 1^{10} (where both *ἐπιφανεία* and *φανερόω* are used of the earthly life), and less emphatically in 1 Tim. 3^{16}. But ideas of the Logos are outside our author's sphere of thought. The purpose of His Coming was the salvation of man (1 Tim. 1^{15}); this purpose existed eternally and is now realised (2 Tim. 1^{9}). Hence the repeated clauses—grace, salvation, faith, love "that is in Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. 1^{14} 3^{13}, 2 Tit. $2^{1, 10, 13}$). Again,

He is the "one Mediator between God and man, Himself man." The term "man" seems to denote humanity in the abstract; but while asserting the reality of the human it does not deny the Divine nature. The mediation is explained as referring to the work of redemption in which He gave Himself "a ransom for all." But the objective facts of the Resurrection and Ascension, of angelic manifestation and the planting of the Church (1 Tim. 3^{16}, 2 Tim. 1^{10}), are more to this writer than any dogmatic interpretation of them. Again, he looks forward to the Second Coming and the Final Judgment. The term *Παρουσία* has not yet found its special use, and *Ἐπιφάνεια*, which is similarly used in 2 Maccabees, is chosen to express the splendour of the Advent in Glory of Him who already had met his teacher in dazzling and indescribable light. This Epiphany is an event to be looked for (Tit. 2^{13}), which will come in its due time (1 Tim. 6^{15}), when apparently (2 Tim. 4^{1}) its coming will be the inauguration of the Kingdom. And lastly, Christ will be the Judge of the quick and the dead (2 Tim. $4^{1.\,8}$). It is notable that these last texts occur only in Paul's solemn charge; and it may be inferred that here (as in Acts 17^{31}, cf. 2 Cor. 5^{10}) the disciple is recording the teaching of his apostolic guide.

Regarding the Holy Spirit there is less than one might expect from the historian of Pentecost. There are indeed references to the outpouring and to prophesying (Tit. 3^{6}, 1 Tim. 4^{1}), as in *Acts*; but as regards powers the era of "signs and wonders"

seems over. In the more Pauline Epistle we have a statement of "indwelling" (2 Tim. 1^{14}), but it shows the form rather than the substance of Paul. And there is one strong term, "renewal," in the faithful saying in Titus. The passage is highly composite, and the verse containing this term (3^5) seems partly a quotation from a hymn or church lesson.

Of all doctrines perhaps the most fundamental in the writer's mind is that of Immortality. He too, like Paul, though in a different way, bases his faith on the Resurrection. The doctrine, it is true, rests ultimately on the nature of God, who is living and life-sustaining and imperishable. To Him belongs a hidden world of reality which is "life eternal" and "life indeed" (1 Tim. $6^{12.\ 19}$). God's purpose and grace, or purpose of grace, is outside time, before "times eternal"; but it is revealed in the career of Him who triumphed over death, bringing it to nought (2 Tim. 1^{9-10}). The Resurrection is the supreme manifestation thereof. By it death was destroyed, and incorruption brought into light. The Resurrection was as a flash of light on the world within the veil. The term used, *φωτίζω*, may describe the illuminating effects of sunshine (Diod.), and it is applied in 1 Cor. 4^5 to the hidden world of darkness. But in 2 Cor. $4^{4.\ 6}$ the subst. *φωτισμός* is extended to the spiritual and Divine glory. The apostles believed that the hidden world of the heavenlies was made luminous, and was shown to be incorruptible, by the spiritual splendour of the risen Christ. Hence

this author, like Paul, places his faith in the Resurrection, styling Christ "our hope" or "our Saviour" (1 Tim. 1^{1}, Tit. 1^{4}), and cherishing the anticipation of the "blessed hope," the "hope of eternal life" (Tit. 1^{2} 2^{13} 3^{7}). Yet there are no details regarding the Resurrection, save a reference to a peculiar heresy (2 Tim. 2^{18}); and no conceptions of the risen body or of the likeness of the image of Christ, but simply the assurance of life—true, pure, perfect, imperishable, eternal life.

Soteriology is the main doctrinal theme. We note that the terms "save," "salvation," are used of the present, and not directly (as in the second group, or in Rom. $5^{9.10}$) of the future after death. The point of view in 1 Tim. 1^{15} is the same as in Luke 15, or $19^{9.10}$, or in Acts 2^{47} 4^{12} 16^{31}. The salvation is, of course, appropriated by faith; but as πίστις has now a new meaning, it will follow that usually (as in John) this saving faith will be expressed by the verb "believe." Salvation must include "forgiveness"; but it is remarkable that the term (frequent enough in Luke-Acts) does not here occur. This may arise from the circumstance that in the narrative books non-Christians, but in the Epistles Christians only, are in view; though it is notable that the same omission pertains to Paul, and thus the Pastorals may deliberately represent the apostle's manner. Regarding the moral purpose of salvation all groups agree; but Luke has his own terminology, and there are two places that specially invite attention. Christ gave

Himself for us (Tit. 2^{14}) to "redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto Himself" a people that will live unto Him. Paul too speaks of redemption, *ἀπολύτρωσις*; and the term used here, *λυτρόω*, has a Hebraic look, but though it is found in the LXX it pertains also to secular Greek, to Plato and to Polybius and Diodorus. In the N.T. it is elsewhere found only in Luke 24^{21}, 1 Pet. 1^{18}. It implies a price paid, an *ἀντίλυτρον*, 1 Tim. 2^{6}, which was the surrender of life. The aim of redemption is not only deliverance from "lawlessness," but, more positively, the "purifying" of a people, that is to say, the moral regeneration, and inspiration with beneficent zeal, of those who are to constitute the Church. This is one of the sentences where the styles of the Pastoral and the Exhortation Groups seem blended. It is the only sentence which is supposed to be based on the O.T., and though the terms belong to Greek literature as well as to the LXX we must acknowledge that here we have not merely the simple style of Luke. The terms "people" and "iniquity," *λαός* and *ἀνομία*, suggest the influence of the author of the second group, or possibly some manual from which both draw. The verbs "redeem" and "purify" belong chiefly to that Græco-Jewish literature with which both are familiar, though on the other two groups (Paul and Timothy) it exerted no influence. Farther on, 3^{5-7}, there is a no less remarkable statement pointing to the same origin. It is doubtful whether the "regeneration" and the "renewal" are the same thing, or are to be

reckoned different, as the external from the internal, or as the earlier from the later stage. "Renewing" we take to be governed by "through," as in the Revised margin, though it may indicate an immediate effect rather than a continuous operation. The rendering "laver" is, we think, wrong, though a reference to baptism is probable; and the meaning may recall Acts 22^{9}, "wash away thy sins." While the former passage chiefly recalled 1 Peter, this forcibly reminds us of Ephesians, especially of 5^{26} but also of 4^{23}. In both cases of parallels there is essential similarity of thought with apparently studied variation of expression. And here the connection is no less close with John 3^{5}, "born of water and of the Spirit." The use of *παλιγγενεσία* is also akin to John, not Matthew. Again, the term "poured out" connects the passage with Acts 1^{8}, which must have come to Luke from a source such as the second group represents. The closing clause, "that being justified . . . ," is based on Rom. 3^{14} 8^{17}, and may be assigned to Luke; its twofold expression may be regarded as confirming the dual interpretation of the preceding part. The passage is a "faithful saying," and we regard it as a Lucan expansion of some aphorism of Silas or his school. It is at least self-evident that these two texts differ widely from anything else in the Pastorals.

Do we then find in these Epistles a doctrine of the Atonement? Not indeed of expiation or of substitution, but yet of ransom (1 Tim. 2^{6}, Tit. 2^{14}); and this ransom was provided when

Christ "gave Himself" in man's behalf. Connections, therefore, with strict Paulinism, as well as with the second group, exist; but no complete system involving correlated ideas of sin and guilt and propitiation and the full significance of the Redeemer's work. The main ideas are moral and practical; how to make the word of God effective, and to promote the life according to godliness which is manifested in piety, purity, and beneficence.

Do these Epistles, then, teach salvation by works? Not, certainly, as the ultimate ground of salvation. Such a view is, in Pauline fashion, expressly repudiated (2 Tim. 1^9, Tit. 3^5), as it is also in Eph. 2^9. But "good works" is a recurring burden, and the minister must be completely furnished thereunto. This point need not be enlarged on, for it is written large in every chapter. The Epistles are a manual of practical Christianity, a text-book for the pastor of a people. We find nothing transcendent, of mystic union or of spiritual experience. But the "good works" commended are such as are truly good; not the observances of the Jewish law, not rites or forms or ceremonies such as in the Judaic world presented themselves in opposition to the spirit and progress of the gospel. They are not custom and ritual, but rectitude and social beneficence. They are the service of man in which Christ lived. They are "the work of the Lord" in which, following the footsteps of Jesus, Paul urged all disciples to abound.

This chapter may close with a few sentences on the mind and influence of Luke. The late Dean Farrar, who was incapable of believing that the author of the *Acts* could have written a speech attributed to Paul, nevertheless with genuine insight observed that the spirit of Luke's Gospel was embodied in Paul's address to the Athenians. There we see him, a cosmopolitan, free of Jewish accent, full of sympathy with the Gentile, but conscious of a new revelation and of the reality of responsibility to God. He is a Christian void of all trace of the Pharisaism or the sacrificialism or the asceticism that marked the leading Jewish parties. To him "every creature of God is good if it is sanctified with gratitude and prayer." Christianity presents itself to his mind as a revelation of God's mercy and as a chart of guidance in the way of life. These conceptions are expressed in variety of form and with versatility of mind. The mercy of God is shown in the sending of a Saviour, in the deliverance from sin, and in the gospel of eternal life. The merciful God is a lover of men, who wishes all to be saved. Of such sentiments we have the classical expression in the parable of the Prodigal Son. But again, Christianity is a rule of conduct. The author's ideal is a quiet and peaceful life in all sobriety and godliness. Good things are not to be despised, and the new religion commends itself as beneficial for both worlds. But wealth, and pride, and high-mindedness—these belong to the sphere of evil. In the early days of the Church, around which a halo

already shone, the brethren had all things in common. Prosperity and happiness abounded. Now the days seem darkening; and it is urgently necessary that the new generation be confirmed in the faith, and disciplined in godly teaching. It is the rampant evil of the world that makes him emphasise the graces of meekness, simplicity, and contentment. It is the danger of worldliness and apostasy that makes him urge the constancy of admonition, instruction, and catechetical discipline. Next to godliness his chief virtue is sobriety, a gentle firmness, a gracious sanity. And it is in the qualities of breadth and sanity of judgment that Luke is the most modern of the Scripture writers, and most allied to ourselves.

Besides his services as historian and teacher, Luke has laid us under additional obligations by his enrichment of language. That union of Hebraism and Hellenism which literary scholars have desired was in this writer accomplished eighteen centuries ago; and the effect thereof in the sphere of expression has been of permanent benefit to the Church. The power of the English Bible is admittedly enhanced by the charm and dignity of its style. Possibly the Greek original of the N.T. owed more than we suppose to Luke. The discovery now made that it is written in a common speech of the time must be received with limitation. Uncommon thoughts give a new character even to common words. Luke's speech was not the classic Greek of ancient Athens, but it was the speech of the educated men of his day through-

out the provinces of the Græco-Roman world. And it contains many of the terms that through all the history of Greek thought expressed enlightened ideas of religion or life. Therefore we owe to him the expression of Hebraic thought in language easily intelligible to the general world. Moreover, by skilful periods, by literary imagination, by a sense of artistic form, and by choice words laden with the intellectual associations of centuries of mental activity, he has dignified and ennobled much that otherwise would have been commonplace. There is a moral and spiritual quality in speech which makes it part of the soul of a people. Language lofty and undefiled is one of the forces that maintain a nation on a higher plane of civilisation. As we believe that Paul was providentially raised to rescue Christianity from the shell of Judaism and to make it the religion of the world, no less truly may we suppose that Luke, the humble freedman of Antioch, was raised to translate the new ideas into world-wide speech, to pour the ethereal metal into new moulds, and to tell the tender mercy of God in forms and words of beauty that have borne for ages the accent of inspiration.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Adoption, 145.
Alexandria, 53.
Angels, 159, 276.
Apollos, 71.
Atonement, 250, 276, 367.

Baur, 6, 232.
Bishops, 356.
Blood, 275.
Buddha, 34.

Celts, 107.
Cerinthus, 327.
Charisms, 239.
Christ, above creation, 147.
——, Headship of, 196, 314.
——, Person of, 252.
Christology, 309.
Church, 279.
Church as a unity, 202.
Colossæ and Colossians, 126, 300.
1 and 2 Corinthians, 66.
Covenant, 32.
Cross, the, 146.

Death of sin, 144.
Destiny of redeemed, 363.
Development, 171.
Didache, 360.

Ephesians, 126, 180, 207.
Eschatology, 12, 47, 283.
Excommunication, 73.
Exile, 33.
Expiation, 137.

Flesh and spirit, 157.
Forgiveness, 146.

Galatia and Galatians, 103, 104, 108.
Gnostics, 319, 359.
God, Father, 152, 361.

Hebrews, 211.
Hellenism, 15.

Idols, things offered to, 76.
Image of Christ, 161.
Image of God, 88.
Immortality, 45, 364.

John and Colossians, 324.
Jude, 214.
Justification, 141, 145.

Kenosis, 118, 148.
Kingdom of the heavens, 254.

Law, 13.
Law and freedom, 114.
Liberty, 170.
Life in the Spirit, 156.
Life of faith, 165.
Logos, 53.
Lord's Prayer, 258.
Lord's Supper, 77.
Luke, 24.
——, his influence, 369.
——, his language, 339, 370.

Mark, Gospel of, 305.
Marriage, 74.
Matthew, Gospel of, 246.
Messiah, 47.
Mystery, 19, 73.

Paley, 10.
Parousia, 223, 254, 283.
Pastoral Epistles, 329.
Paul, visions of, 59.
——, missionary journeys of, 62.
——, characteristics of, 173.
——, style of, 175.
Pentateuch, 8.
1 Peter, 208.
Pharisees, 49.
Philemon, 127, 304.
Philippians, 116.

Reconciliation, 135.
Resurrection, 48, 82.
Righteousness of God, 119, 139.
Romans, Epistle to, 96.

Sacrifice, 273.
Sadducees, 51.
Satan, 159.
Sermon on the Mount, 250, 257.
Silas, 92.
Sin, 134.
Sirach, 53, 54.
Soteriology, 273, 365.
Spirit, 39, 73, 79, 153, 169.
——, gifts of, 80.

Temple, the new, 198.
1 and 2 Thessalonians, 125, 215.
Timothean group, 295.
1 Timothy, 130.
——, and Luke, 335.
2 Timothy, 128, 352.
Titus, 69, 86, 131, 337, 355.
Trinity, 271.

Wisdom of Solomon, 53, 54.
Word, 40.

Zoroaster, 34.

INDEX OF CHIEF TEXTS

MATTHEW

CHAP.	PAGE
10^{26}	247
18	260
20^{28}	251
26^{28}	251, 274

ROMANS

1^{17}	140
2^{16}	15
$5^{10, 11}$	135
11^{15}	135
12–15	237
15^{24}	98
16	100, 245

1 CORINTHIANS

1	70
3^{16-17}	93
7–9	75
8^{6}	147
11^{25}	32
11^{2-34}	77
12	78, 79
13	81
15	29, 83, 93, 233
16	84, 93

2 CORINTHIANS

1^{8}	29
3^{3}	32
3–5	86
$5^{18, 19, 20}$	135
6^{14}	29, 93, 236

1 THESSALONIANS

CHAP.	PAGE
1–3	126
1^{5}	296
1^{8}	217
1^{10}	297
2^{11}	297
$2^{15, 16}$	228
4^{1-2}	221
4^{11-12}	219
4^{16}	225
5^{2-6}	225
5^{12}	218

2 THESSALONIANS

1^{3-10}	218, 229
2^{1-11}	226, 229
2^{7-8}	227
3^{6-12}	219

GALATIANS

2^{20}	113
3^{13}	114, 144
4^{24}	32
5^{11}	110
5^{2-26}	115
6^{17}	110

EPHESIANS

1^{1}	182
1^{10}	195
1^{14-22}	189, 197
2^{1-10}	197
3^{1-12}	199

CHAP.	PAGE
$4^{1\text{-}16}$	200
4^{32}	146
$5^{2\text{-}26}$	187

PHILIPPIANS

$1^{12\text{-}25}$	122
2^{7}	14
3^{5}	16
$3^{8\text{-}11}$	119
3^{21}	121

COLOSSIANS

1^{4}	302
1^{6}	306
$1^{16\text{-}18}$	309, 314
2^{1}	127
2^{8}	312
$2^{11\text{-}14}$	317
$3^{1\text{-}10}$	311, 312
4^{6}	307

1 TIMOTHY

1^{9}	368
1^{15}	365
2^{5}	351
2^{6}	337, 367
$3^{5\text{-}7}$	366
4^{2}	339
4^{13}	339
$5^{6\text{-}18\text{-}21}$	335
5^{23}	323
$6^{12\text{-}19}$	364

2 TIMOTHY

1^{10}	362
$2^{11\text{-}17}$	337, 339
$4^{6\text{-}8}$	130
4^{10}	128
$4^{3\text{-}16\text{-}18}$	340, 353

TITUS

1^{12}	337, 342
1^{14}	341
1^{15}	337
2^{14}	366
3^{5}	368
3^{13}	131

1 PETER

$1^{11\text{-}20\text{-}22}$	210
$3^{18\text{-}19\text{-}21}$	209, 210, 211
5^{19}	211

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, *Edinburgh*